MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., March 28, 1952

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, March 28, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Office.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on February 26, 1952, were approved.

2. EQUIPMENT FOR THE COMMISSION ROOM: The Secretary reported that he had secured estimates for additional equipment for the Commission Room; that it would be possible to secure an additional table, as desired by the Chairman, so that the two could be placed end to end. The Secretary recommended that, instead of constructing a partition wall, another display panel be secured similar to the one now used, that could be placed between pillars or moved onto the floor as may be found desirable during meetings of the Commission. The Commission agreed to this.

After discussion, it was decided to hold the question of ordering another table in abeyance, but to order a suitable rug for the west end of the room. No objection was made to placing two low bookcases against the west wall.

3. PATHOLOGIC BUILDING, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: The Secretary read a letter (Exhibit A) received from the Department of Defense, stating that construction work on the building could not be further delayed, and indicating, therefore, that certain recommendations made by the Commission regarding

June 30 1952

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., March 28, 1952

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, March 28, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Bellucchi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on February 26, 1952, were approved.

2. EQUIPMENT FOR THE COMMISSION ROOM: The Secretary reported that he had secured estimates for additional equipment for the Commission Room; that it would be possible to secure an additional table, as desired by the Chairman, so that the two could be placed end to end. The Secretary recommended that, instead of constructing a partition wall, another display panel be secured similar to the one now used, that could be placed between pillars or moved onto the floor as may be found desirable during meetings of the Commission. The Commission agreed to this.

After discussion, it was decided to hold the question of ordering another table in abeyance, but to order a suitable rug for the west end of the room.

No objection was made to placing two low bookcases against the west wall.

3. PATHOLOGIC BUILDING, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: The Secretary read a letter (Exhibit A) received from the Department of Defense, stating that construction work on the building could not be further delayed, and indicating, therefore, that certain recommendations made by the Commission regarding

tests and the use of certain building material could not be followed.

The Commission concluded that this was an indication that the Department of the Army wanted to construct the building as they desired, and ordered that the letter be filed.

4. RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE PAINTINGS (SAN FRANCISCO): Chairman Finley brought to the attention of the Commission a letter received from Artists Equity Association of New York (Exhibit B) protesting against an attempt to destroy these paintings.

The Commission considered the matter. It was recalled that these paintings were executed a number of years ago by Anton Refregier. Prof. Belluschi said that some people may like the paintings, others not; that Refregier is a very skilful artist; and that when it comes to subject matter that would seem to be one outside of the scope of authority of this Commission. It was noted from a copy of a letter sent by Commissioner Reynolds on November 21, 1951, "No decision has been made with respect to the controversial question of the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office."

Since the Public Buildings Office confers with the Commission of Fine Arts regarding paintings in public buildings and has not referred to the Commission any question concerning the Rincon Post Office Mural Paintings, the Commission felt that no action was called for at this time. The Commission, therefore, decided to await a communication from Mr. Reynolds on the subject before replying to the Artists Equity Association.

5. SUBMISSIONS TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Mr. Peets recommended that time be allowed for a private discussion by the Commission when projects are submitted. He said, "We have found in the past so often that it has been very useful when we have had such discussion and sometimes very embarrassing when we have not had; so I am strong for arranging, if there is any probability

tests and the use of certain building material could not be followed.

The Commission concluded that this was an indication that the Department of the Army wanted to construct the building as they desired, and ordered that the letter be filed.

4. RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE PAINTINGS (SAN FRANCISCO): Chairman Finley brought to the attention of the Commission a letter received from Artists Equity Association of New York (Exhibit B) protesting against an attempt to destroy these paintings.

The Commission considered the matter. It was recalled that these paintings were executed a number of years ago by Anton Refregier. Prof. Bellusch said that some people may like the paintings, others not; that Refregier is a very skilful artist; and that when it comes to subject matter that would seem to be one outside of the scope of authority of this Commission. It was noted from a copy of a letter sent by Commissioner Reynolds on November 21, 1951, "No decision has been made with respect to the controversial question of the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office."

Since the Public Buildings Office confers with the Commission of Fine Arts regarding paintings in public buildings and has not referred to the Commission any question concerning the Rincon Post Office Mural Paintings, the Commission felt that no action was called for at this time. The Commission, therefore, decided to await a communication from Mr. Reynolds on the subject before replying to the Artists Equity Association.

5. SUBMISSIONS TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Mr. Peets recommended that time be allowed for a private discussion by the Commission when projects are submitted. He said, "We have found in the past so often that it has been very useful when we have had such discussion and sometimes very embarrassing when we have not had; so I am strong for arranging, if there is any probability

of it, a little private discussion," and postpone a decision until after such private discussion.

Professor Hudnut suggested as a procedure, "The witnesses come in and leave; we discuss it; make our decision and recommendation; the witnesses can wait outside if they wish, and thereupon return to the Commission Room. But the official report would be made by letter. The Commission agreed to this procedure to be followed in the future.

6. REVISED DESIGN FOR PEDESTAL, LAST FAREWELL: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assistant Superintendent, National Capital Parks, National Park Service, submitted a revised design for the pedestal of this proposed statue, to be placed in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery; designed by McKim, Mead and White, architects, and A. A. Weinman, sculptor. It is to be a simple granite (Mount Airy) block, measuring approximately 10 feet high, and 6 feet wide and deep. The statue is to be in bronze, 18 feet high.

Mr. Peets asked about plans for the planting of that area. Mr. Thompson replied, "We have made some studies but we have been so terribly busy with our park work, including parkway work along the Washington-Baltimore Parkway now under construction, as also with finishing the job at the White House before the President's return, that we have not had time to complete the drawings."

After some discussion, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit C).

7. KASS REALTY PROPERTY AT 25TH AND E STREETS, N. W.: Chairman Finley read a letter (Exhibit D) received from Hon. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, General Services Administration, in which he seemed to object to purchasing the five lots owned by the Kass Realty Company at 25th and E Streets, N. W., stating that the Committee on Appropriations of Congress might object.

The Commission recalled that the President had requested the Director of the Budget to direct the Administrator of General Services to buy these lots

of it, a little private discussion," and postpone a decision until after such private discussion.

Professor Hudnut suggested as a procedure, "The witnesses come in and leave; we discuss it; make our decision and recommendation; the witnesses can wait outside if they wish, and thereupon return to the Commission Room. But the official report would be made by letter. The Commission agreed to this procedure to be followed in the future.

6. REVISED DESIGN FOR PEDESTAL, LAST FARRAGUT: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assistant Superintendent, National Capital Parks, National Park Service, submitted a revised design for the pedestal of this proposed statue, to be placed in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery; designed by McKim, Mead and White, architects, and A. A. Weinman, sculptor. It is to be a simple granite (Mount Airy) block, measuring approximately 10 feet high, and 6 feet wide and deep. The statue is to be in bronze, 18 feet high.

Mr. Peets asked about plans for the planting of that area. Mr. Thompson replied, "We have made some studies but we have been so terribly busy with our park work, including parkway work along the Washington-Baltimore Parkway now under construction, as also with finishing the job at the White House before the President's return, that we have not had time to complete the drawings."

After some discussion, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit C).

7. KASS REALTY PROPERTY AT 25TH AND E STREETS, N. W.: Chairman Finley read a letter (Exhibit D) received from Hon. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, General Services Administration, in which he seemed to object to purchasing the five lots owned by the Kass Realty Company at 25th and E Streets, N. W., stating that the Committee on Appropriations of Congress might object.

The Commission recalled that the President had requested the Director of the Budget to direct the Administrator of General Services to buy these lots

from a fund of $2,000,000 made available to the Public Buildings Service for buying the old Heurich Brewery in the immediate vicinity.

The Secretary reported that the Kass Realty Company is anxious to build an apartment at the site, and to do so would be a serious encroachment on plans for the development of the waterfront; also the apartment would be in a restricted area occupied now by temporary war buildings, in which offices of the Department of State are located; that it is scarcely possible to stop the apartment development if the Kass Realty Company should apply to the Building Inspector of the District of Columbia for a permit to build.

The Commission considered the matter thoroughly and decided that the Chairman should send a letter to Mr. Reynolds explaining the importance of having these lots purchased without further delay. Mr. Finley said he would write such a letter accordingly, and the same was sent (Exhibit E).

8. OFFICE-GARAGE BUILDING: The Secretary reported that the Kass Realty Company has asked permission to submit a design to the Commission of Fine Arts for an Office-Garage Building at Thirteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. About a year and a half ago a design for such a building to be seven stories high, at this location, was submitted by that Company to the Commission, and was approved. Now the Company wants to build to the full height allowed under the Zoning Regulations, namely, 130 feet with set-backs, and a 110 foot facade facing Pennsylvania Avenue. There would be stores on the first floor and offices above the seventh floor. The Zoning Regulations allow 12 stories, but the Zoning Commission is considering an amendment to allow 14 stories within the 130 foot limit. On the E Street side would be a ramp for the parking garage.

Indications were that, because of a meeting of the Zoning Commission to consider the proposed amendment, the architects did not arrive at the appointed time, and the matter was therefore held in abeyance until the next meeting of

from a fund of $2,000,000 made available to the Public Buildings Service for buying the old Heurich Brewery in the immediate vicinity.

The Secretary reported that the Kass Realty Company is anxious to build an apartment at the site, and to do so would be a serious encroachment on plans for the development of the waterfront; also the apartment would be in a restricted area occupied now by temporary war buildings, in which offices of the Department of State are located; that it is scarcely possible to stop the apartment development if the Kass Realty Company should apply to the Building Inspector of the District of Columbia for a permit to build.

The Commission considered the matter thoroughly and decided that the Chairman should send a letter to Mr. Reynolds explaining the importance of having these lots purchased without further delay. Mr. Tinley said he would write such a letter accordingly, and the same was sent (Exhibit E).

8. OFFICE-GARAGE BUILDING: The Secretary reported that the Kass Realty Company has asked permission to submit a design to the Commission of Fine Arts for an Office-Garage Building at Thirteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. About a year and a half ago a design for such a building to be seven stories high, at this location, was submitted by that Company to the Commission, and was approved. Now the Company wants to build to the full height allowed under the Zoning Regulations, namely, 130 feet with set-backs, and a 110 foot facade facing Pennsylvania Avenue. There would be stores on the first floor and offices above the seventh floor. The Zoning Regulations allow 12 stories, but the Zoning Commission is considering an amendment to allow 14 stories within the 130 foot limit. On the E Street side would be a ramp for the parking garage.

Indications were that, because of a meeting of the Zoning Commission to consider the proposed amendment, the architects did not arrive at the appointed time, and the matter was therefore held in abeyance until the next meeting of

the Commission.

9. SCULPTURE FOR THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK: Chairman Finley submitted the following letter on the subject:

March 13, 1952

Dear Mr. Finley:

A group, which for the time being prefers to remain anonymous, has offered a gift to the National Zoological Park of a bear cub carved in stone by Cornelia Van A. Chapin. From my lay viewpoint, this is a most attractive study, and the Institution would be very glad to accept it for the National Zoological Park provided it receives the approval of the Fine Arts Commission.

I am enclosing several photographs illustrating the work of the sculptress, including a side view of the bear cub. It also appears in the background of another one of the photographs. These prints are the property of Mrs. Biddle, and I assume she will wish them returned.

Enclosed also is a statement on Cornelia Van A. Chapin and her work. Should you desire any further information for the use of the Commission, it can probably be obtained from Mrs. Francis Biddle, 1669 31st Street, N. W., Washington D. C. We would also be glad to provide what information is available to us.

Mr. Mann, Director of the National Zoological Park, has seen these photographs and feels that the study in question would be a valuable addition to the Zoo.

I hope you will find it possible to bring this matter before the Fine Arts Commission at its next meeting.

Sincerely yours,
J. E. Graf,
Acting Secretary.

The Commission inspected the photographs of the sculpture under consideration, as well as photographs of other work by the artist, who is recognized as an able sculptor. Upon the recommendation of Mr. deWeldon, the Commission approved the sculpture offered for the National Zoological Park (Exhibit F).

10. THE L'ENFANT PLAN: During a preliminary discussion with regard to a suggested location for an Air Force Museum adjacent to the War College, along the Anacostia River, comprising about 50 acres, Mr. Peets said: "The question of a new bridge across the Potomac at Roosevelt Island should be considered in relation to the traffic situation at the Lincoln Memorial. That situation is extremely serious—it is tragically unfortunate that traffic must be carried around the Memorial, endangering visitors and preventing comfortable pedestrian

the Commission.

9. SCULPTURE FOR THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK: Chairman Finley submitted the following letter on the subject:

March 13, 1952

Dear Mr. Finley:

A group, which for the time being prefers to remain anonymous, has offered a gift to the National Zoological Park of a bear cub carved in stone by Cornelia Van A. Chapin. From my lay viewpoint, this is a most attractive study, and the Institution would be very glad to accept it for the National Zoological Park provided it receives the approval of the Fine Arts Commission.

I am enclosing several photographs illustrating the work of the sculptress, including a side view of the bear cub. It also appears in the background of another one of the photographs. These prints are the property of Mrs. Biddle, and I assume she will wish them returned.

Enclosed also is a statement on Cornelia Van A. Chapin and her work. Should you desire any further information for the use of the Commission, it can probably be obtained from Mrs. Francis Biddle, 1689 Jlat Street, N. W., Washington D. C. We would also be glad to provide what information is available to us.

Mr. Mann, Director of the National Zoological Park, has seen these photographs and feels that the study in question would be a valuable addition to the Zoo.

I hope you will find it possible to bring this matter before the Fine Arts Commission at its next meeting.

Sincerely yours,
J. E. Graf,
Acting Secretary.

The Commission inspected the photographs of the sculpture under consideration, as well as photographs of other work by the artist, who is recognized as an able sculptor. Upon the recommendation of Mr. deWeldon, the Commission approved the sculpture offered for the National Zoological Park (Exhibit F).

10. THE L'ENFANT PLAN: During a preliminary discussion with regard to a suggested location for an Air Force Museum adjacent to the War College, along the Anacostia River, comprising about 50 acres, Mr. Peets said: "The question of a new bridge across the Potomac at Roosevelt Island should be considered in relation to the traffic situation at the Lincoln Memorial. That situation is extremely serious--it is tragically unfortunate that traffic must be carried around the Memorial, endangering visitors and preventing comfortable pedestrian

movement between the Memorial and the reflecting-basin area. This is ruinously destructive of the dignity, beauty, and monumental significance of the Lincoln Memorial. If a new bridge should permit the elimination of traffic east of the Memorial, I believe we ought to consider carefully before opposing its construction.

Such a bridge would have disadvantages, but it would not "destroy" Roosevelt Island. It would cross the Island at one end and could probably be kept low enough to be below the tree tops and could be carried on posts that would not cut off surface views.

I appreciate the great value of masses of natural foliage around Washington and especially along the Potomac. But I believe that the saving of the Lincoln Memorial is tremendously important and that we should not refuse to consider a proposal which gives promise, however slight, of correcting that deplorable situation."

The subject was discussed, and it was thought desirable to arrange for a joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in the near future to consider this and other matters in which both Commissions are concerned. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit G). A letter was sent to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission accordingly (Exhibit ~~G-1~~). → See Minutes 2 May 1947 for Ex. G-1

11. THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND: Major General U. S. Grant III (Retired) and Mr. Hermann Hagedorn, Secretary and Director of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association presented a complaint from that Association against a proposal of Engineer Commissioner Bernard L. Robinson of the District of Columbia and the Highway Department to build a bridge on the line of E Street, N. W. across Theodore Roosevelt Island to Virginia.

Both General Grant and Mr. Hagedorn presented strong objections as to why this should not be done, and stated that it would violate ar agreement set

forth in an Act of Congress approved May 21, 1932 (Public Law 146, 72nd Congress). This law provides, "***That no general plan for the development of the island be adopted without the approval of the Roosevelt Memorial Association, and that so long as this association remains in existence, no development inconsistent with this plan, be executed without the association's consent."

The Commission decided that it would be a serious encroachment on the landscape to have a bridge cross Roosevelt Island, and requested Professor Hudnut to draft a Resolution accordingly. This he did, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED BRIDGE OVER THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

The protection of the parks of Washington is a responsibility which rests upon every agent concerned with municipal affairs. Washington has few parks but they are of supreme beauty and of course must be protected for the benefit of those who live after us.

Whenever, therefore, a proposal is made by any agency for a project which might impinge upon a park or number of parks in Washington, this proposal must be given most careful scrutiny to make sure that it is not injurious to the character and usefulness of the parks. If it should appear that any proposal tends to defeat beauty or usefulness of a park, this proposal must not be adopted until every alternate proposal has been carefully examined and every possible means taken to minimize injury done to the parks.

One of the loveliest areas in the City of Washington is that section of the Potomac which lies north of the Memorial Bridge. By good fortune a lovely stretch of the River has been preserved,

together with charming landscapes on all sides. To the west lie meadows crowned by the hills of Arlington; to the east, the white temple of the Lincoln Memorial, with its beautiful embankments and its noble bridge; and at the north lies one of the loveliest fragments of untouched forest lands in any city of America and forming an island of great beauty. This is the Theodore Roosevelt Island.

In the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts the bridge proposed at E Street and carried directly across Theodore Roosevelt Island would in large measure destroy the beauty of this remarkable landscape lying at the very centre of greater Washington. The bridge would bisect the land lying north of the Memorial Bridge and destroy its unity.

The Theodore Roosevelt Island was a gift to the Government by a number of friends of President Roosevelt and, in accepting this gift, the Government agreed to preserve this land as a sylvan reserve, apart from the city and to preserve it in a natural state, untouched by artificial constructions. Quite aside from its relation to the Potomac landscapes, the island itself is of inestimable value to the City of Washington and in the future this value will progressively increase.

Now, therefore, the Commission of Fine Arts resolves that they will bring these considerations to the attention of those in authority and will urge that the project for the E Street bridge be carefully reconsidered and every alternate proposal examined with the greatest care.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit H).

12. AIR FORCE MUSEUM: The Commission were in conference with Colonel Arthur J. Larsen of the Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

becoming with charming landscapes on all sides. To the west lie meadows crowned by the hills of Arlington; to the east, the white temple of the Lincoln Memorial, while the beautiful [illegible] the Potomac Bridge; and at the north [illegible] ments of untouched forest lands in any city of America and forming an island of great beauty. This is the Theodore Roosevelt Island.

In the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts the bridge proposed at E Street and carried directly across Theodore Roosevelt Island would in large measure destroy the beauty of this remarkable landscape lying at the very centre of greater Washington. The bridge would dissect the land lying north of the Memorial Bridge and destroy its unity.

The Theodore Roosevelt Island was a gift to the Government by a number of friends of President Roosevelt and, in accepting this gift, the Government agreed to preserve this land as a sylvan reserve, apart from the city and to preserve it in a natural state, untouched by artificial constructions. Quite aside from its relation to the Potomac landscape, the island itself is of inestimable value to the City of Washington and in the future this value will progressively increase.

Now, therefore, the Commission of Fine Arts resolves that they will bring these considerations to the attention of those in authority and will urge that the project for the E Street bridge be carefully reconsidered and every alternate proposal examined with the greatest care.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part [illegible]

[illegible].

16. AIR FORCE MUSEUM: The Commission were in conference with Colonel Arthur G. Larsen of the Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense,

regarding the establishment of an Air Force Museum at a proposed Air Force Academy, to be similar to the one for the Army at West Point, and the one for the Navy at Annapolis.

Earlier in the Session, Chairman Finley had informed the Commission of a plan to establish a National Air Museum in Washington, as comtemplated by Public Law 722, of the 79th Congress, approved August 12, 1946 (Exhibit I) as part of the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Finley said:

> "It was shortly after the War, I think, under the leadership of some Air Force officers, that there was interest expressed in an Air Museum, showing the history of air power, with exhibits such as the Lindbergh plane and other examples of aircraft; and a design was made for the building. It was to be a part of the Smithsonian Institution, under the direction of the Secretary of that Institution with no Board of Trustees but reporting directly to Dr. Wetmore and his successors. Nothing happened because Congress did not appropriate the money.
>
> In the meantime the Commission of Fine Arts had been asked to help to find a location for the Museum, and a site adjacent to the War College, along the Anacostia River, was chosen. The area is now largely industrial, and part of the ground is occupied by temporary war buildings."

Colonel Larsen said the Air Force has been in existence for forty years and during that time had made tremendous progress. He called attention to numerous air force trophies that ought to be preserved in a Museum established at an Air Force Academy that is being considered by the Air Force, as heretofore stated. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit J). Since it appeared that Colonel Larsen gave his testimony to promote interest in the art of flying, the question as to

regarding the establishment of an Air Force Museum at a proposed Air Force Academy, to be similar to the one for the Army at West Point, and the one for the Navy at Annapolis.

Earlier in the Session, Chairman Tinley has informed the Commission of a plan to establish a National Air Museum in Washington, as contemplated by Public Law 722, of the 75th Congress, approved August 12, 1946 (Exhibit 1) as part of the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Tinley said:

"It was shortly after the War, I think, under the leadership of some Air Force officers, that there was interest expressed in an Air Museum, showing the history of air power, with exhibits such as the Lindbergh plane and other examples of aircraft; and a design was made for the building. It was to be a part of the Smithsonian Institution, under the direction of the Secretary of that Institution with no Board of Trustees but reporting directly to Dr. Wetmore and his successors. Nothing happened because Congress did not appropriate the money.

In the meantime the Commission of Fine Arts had been asked to help to find a location for the Museum, and a site adjacent to the War College, along the Anacostia River, was chosen. The area is now largely industrial, and part of the ground is occupied by temporary war buildings."

Colonel Larsen said the Air Force has been in existence for forty years and during that time had made tremendous progress. He called attention to numerous air force trophies that ought to be preserved in a Museum established at an Air Force Academy that is being contemplated by the Air Force, as heretofore stated. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit 4). Since it appeared that Colonel Larsen gave his testimony to promote interest in the art of flying, the question as to

whether or not the statements of Col. Larsen are to be made part of the Report on Government and Art is to be decided some time later. Chairman Finley was of the opinion that it would be difficult to organize two "Air Force Museums" using the same material.

13. PROGRESS REPORT--REPORT ON GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Secretary stated that since the Commission had approved the Minutes of the meeting held on February 26th, he concluded that the Summary by Colonel Bonner is satisfactory. Therefore it is planned to mimeograph the Report on Government and Art to the extent that it has been completed by the May meeting of the Commission.

Professor Hudnut said he plans to write the Introduction during the summer months. This is to include an account to be written by the Secretary on the organization, history and functions of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Peets considered it very desirable to have information concerning the procedure followed by the several Bureaus of the Government concerned in the fine arts in employing artists. He felt a letter should be written to them asking for such information, so that it may be considered in connection with the Report of the Commission on Government and Art, with a view to including portions of such information received in the Report. A letter was sent to several Bureaus accordingly (Exhibit K)

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting in Washington on Wednesday, April 30, 1952.

15. NEW FEDERAL COURT HOUSE: The Commission made an inspection of the New Federal Court House, at third Street and Constitution Avenue. They were accompanied by Mr. Leonard L. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, and Mr. Louis Justement, architect of the building. Mr. Justement explained detailed treatment of the several floors. Thereupon the Commission went to the Seventh Floor. This and the fifth and sixth floors have court rooms. There is also a floor for offices

whether or not the statements of Col. Larson are to be made part of the Report on Government and Art is to be decided some time later. Chairman Finley was of the opinion that it would be difficult to organize two "Air Force Museums" using the same material.

13. PROGRESS REPORT--REPORT ON GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Secretary stated that since the Commission had approved the minutes of the meeting held on February 25th, he concluded that the Summary by Colonel Bonner is satisfactory. Therefore it is planned to mimeograph the Report on Government and Art to the extent that it has been completed by the May meeting of the Commission.

Professor Hudnut said he plans to write the Introduction during the summer months. This is to include an account to be written by the Secretary on the organization, history and functions of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Peets considered it very desirable to have information concerning the procedure followed by the several Bureaus of the Government concerned in the fine arts in employing artists. He felt a letter should be written to them asking for such information, so that it may be considered in connection with the Report of the Commission on Government and Art, with a view to including portions of such information received in the Report. A letter was sent to several Bureaus accordingly (Exhibit K)

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting in Washington on Wednesday, April 30, 1952.

15. NEW FEDERAL COURT HOUSE: The Commission made an inspection of the New Federal Court House, at third Street and Constitution Avenue. They were accompanied by Mr. Leonard I. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, and Mr. Louis Justement, architect of the building. Mr. Justement explained detailed treatment of the several floors. Thereupon the Commission went to the seventh floor. This and the fifth and sixth floors have court rooms. There is also a floor for offices

of attorneys and a library; a floor for jurors with "hotel" accommodations for overnight stay, when necessary. The main floor will be for use of the United States Marshal, Clerk of Court, and other record offices. In the basement will be cells for prisoners. Much of the interior wall space is lined with Tennessee marble and Maryland verde antique. The exterior is in limestone.

Mr. Hunter said bids for a proposed Trylon at the entrance have been excessive and it is a question whether or not it can be erected. The building is to be completed by September of this year.

The Commission had luncheon at the National Gallery of Art, and adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Office of the Under Secretary
Washington D. C,

February 26, 1952

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Reference is made to your letter of 6 November 1951 to the Secretary of Defense, regarding the design and location of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Building.

In appropriating funds for the construction of this building, the Congress placed the responsibility for providing the facilities required for the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology with the Department of the Army. As pointed out in previous correspondence, it was necessary that the design of this facility meet the standards required by the National Security Resources Board for the construction in the District of Columbia area.

The location of the building has been established to take maximum advantage of the interrelation of the functions of this building and the Army Medical Center.

The basic design requirement for a multi-storied building rather than a building design similar to the existing buildings comprising the Army Medical Center was dictated by the functional requirements of the building and the economic necessity for providing a complete facility within the funds appropriated. The engineering requirements for a structure to withstand atomic blast necessitate substantial monolithic construction to prevent shattering of the walls or frame collapse. Facings were blown off buildings at Nagasaki even when the structures themselves were not seriously damaged. Recent atomic tests involving building structures have further proven the undesirability of any siding or wall material which can be detached from the surface or structure by atomic blasts and become dangerous missiles.

Project drawings and specifications have been completed and printed for this building. Both the urgent need for the facilities to be provided by this building and the time limitation placed on the funds for its construction make it imperative that the construction schedule not be further delayed.

Sincerely yours

M. E. Kalette
Consultant

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Office of the Under Secretary
Washington D. C.

February 26, 1952

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Reference is made to your letter of 6 November 1951 to the Secretary of Defense, regarding the design and location of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Building.

In appropriating funds for the construction of this building, the Congress placed the responsibility for providing the facilities required for the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology with the Department of the Army. As pointed out in previous correspondence, it was necessary that the design of this facility meet the standards required by the National Security Resources Board for the construction in the District of Columbia area.

The location of the building has been established to take maximum advantage of the interrelation of the functions of this building and the Army Medical Center.

The basic design requirement for a multi-storied building rather than a building design similar to the existing buildings comprising the Army Medical Center was dictated by the functional requirements of the building and the economic necessity for providing a complete facility within the funds appropriated. The engineering requirements for a structure to withstand atomic blast necessitate substantial monolithic construction to prevent shattering of the walls or frame collapse. Facings were blown off buildings at Nagasaki even when the structures themselves were not seriously damaged. Recent atomic tests involving building structures have further proven the undesirability of any siding or wall material which can be detached from the surface or structure by atomic blasts and become [illegible].

Project drawings and specifications have been completed and printed for this building. Both the urgent need for the facilities to be provided by this building and the time limitation placed on the funds for its construction make it imperative that the construction schedule not be further delayed.

Sincerely yours

[illegible]

EXHIBIT A

ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION
625 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

March 25th, 1952

David Finley
c/o National Gallery of Art
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Some time ago a West Coast columnist reported a rumor that various local organizations were about to win their demands for destruction of one of America's outstanding works of mural decoration. This is the monumental series of murals by Anton Refregier, completed several years ago in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, California, under the program of the Treasury Department's Section of Painting and Sculpture. These paintings, for which the artist was paid $27,000.00 have been widely acclaimed. According to standard procedure, the murals were checked at several stages of production, and corrections were made by the artist as requested. Final payment signified complete acceptance by the Government of these works.

A committee of officers of Artist Equity's local chapter examined the murals to investigate the criticisms that were rumored as reasons for the attack. They found "that as of that date (Nov. 12, 1951) and probably for quite some time previously, the allegations were not true." The chapter feels that "some of the allegations were never true and that the others had all been corrected before the Government accepted the paintings as satisfactory."

Under date of Nov. 21, 1951, W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings (Public Buildings Service, Washington 25, D.C.) stated in reply to a letter from us, "no decision has been made with respect to the controversial question of the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office"; and thus far he has supplied no information as to the nature of the charges nor the basis on which they were entertained.

Artists Equity feels that monumental works of art are important expressions of our living culture, and must not be subject to this type of attack. Failure to defend these works will lead to attacks on others, and the respect due artistic expression will fall to a new low, subjecting American culture to the ridicule of the entire world.

EXHIBIT B

ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION
625 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

David Finley
c/o National Gallery of Art
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Various local organizations were about to win their demands for destruction of one of America's outstanding works of mural decoration. This is the monumental series of murals by Anton Refregier, completed several years ago in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, California, under the program of the Treasury Department's Section of Painting and Sculpture. These paintings, for which the artist was paid $27,000.00 have been widely acclaimed. According to standard procedure, the murals were checked at several stages of production, and corrections were made by the artist as requested. Final payment signified complete acceptance by the Government of these works.

A committee of officers of Artist Equity's [illegible] examined the murals to investigate the [illegible] were rumored as reasons for the attack. They found "that as of that date (Nov. 12, 1951) and probably for quite some time previously, the allegations were not true." The chapter feels that "some of the allegations were never true and that the others had all been corrected before the Government accepted the paintings as satisfactory."

Under date of Nov. 21, 1951, W. T. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings (Public Buildings Service, Washington 25, D.C.) stated in reply to a letter from us, "No decision has been made with respect to the controversial question of the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office"; and thus far he has supplied no information as to the nature of the charges nor the basis on which they were [illegible].

Artists Equity feels that monumental works of art are important expressions of our living culture, and must not be subject to this type of attack. Failure to defend these works will lead to attacks on others, and the respect due artistic expression will fall to a new low, subjecting American culture to the ridicule of the entire world.

EXHIBIT B

Recently, this organization passed the following resolution, establishing its position on the inviolability of monumental work:

"Whereas monumental works of painting or sculpture are peculiarly vulnerable because each example there of is unique, and whereas, the destruction of such a work of art can obliterate in a day the fruits of an artist's best years; and whereas such destruction entails equally destructive consequences to the artist's economic status and professional reputation;

Therefore, it is resolved that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION condemns unconditionally the conscious destruction of works of art, whether painting or sculpture, and whether by private or government agency, that recompense to the artist cannot be considered payment for such destruction, and that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION shall oppose such destruction at all times through all means at its disposal."

Recently these murals were made the subject of attack by Representative Scudder (Rep.-Calif.) speaking before the House Public Works Committee. We have been informed by friends close to the Washington scene that any action taken by this Committee in respect to the murals would be referred to the Fine Arts Commission of which you are Chairman. We therefore earnestly hope that you will study the matter and be prepared to oppose any philistine vandalism that may be attempted.

About a month ago we wrote to museums and art schools throughout the country requesting that they take some action to show the national Government that there are many people in favor of these murals of sufficient status and respect in the community to merit attention. The reply of T. C. Howe, Jr., Director of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor is an example of how many of them feel. I am enclosing a copy of his letter and that of Bartlett Hayes, Director of the Addison Gallery of Art, Andover, Mass. for your examination.

I am sure you will help protect this important work as well as the principle involved, and would be grateful for any advice you could give as regarding further steps we might take to defend it.

Yours very Truly,

ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION
Sgd.
Lincoln Rothschild, Executive Director

IR:lb

enc.

Recently, this organization passed the following resolution, establishing its position on the inviolability of monumental work:

"Whereas monumental works of painting or sculpture are peculiarly vulnerable because each example there of is unique, and whereas, the destruction of such a work of art can obliterate in a day the fruits of an artist's best years; and whereas such destruction entails equally destructive consequences to the artist's economic status and professional reputation;

Therefore, it is resolved that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION condemns unconditionally the conscious destruction of works of art, whether painting or sculpture, and whether by private or government agency, that recompense to the artist cannot be considered payment for such destruction, and that ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION shall oppose such destruction at all times through all means at its disposal."

Recently these murals were made the subject of attack by Representative [illegible] speaking before the House Public Works Committee. We have been informed by friends close to the Washington scene that my action taking my Fine Committee in regard to the murals would be [illegible]

About a month ago we wrote to museums and art schools throughout the country requesting that they take some action to show the national Government that there are many people in favor of these murals of sufficient status and respect in the community to merit [illegible]. The reply of T. C. Howe, Jr., Director of the California [illegible] of the Legion of Honor is an example of how many of them feel. I am [illegible] a copy of his letter and view of [illegible] area. Like[illegible] of the Addison Gallery of Art, Andover, Mass. for your examination.

I am sure you will help protect this important work as well as the principle involved, and would be grateful for any advice you could give as regarding further steps we might take to defend it.

Yours very truly,

ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION

By

[illegible], Executive Director

IR:lb

enc.

THE CALIFORNIA PALACE OF THE LEGION OF HONOR

Lincoln Park

San Francisco 21, California

Office of the Director

February 18, 1952

Reference: D & C-d-PSU
San Francisco, Calif.
Rincon Annex

Mr. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

In reply to your letter of February 8th, I have again inspected the Refregier murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office here. Upon careful examination, they impress me as being admirable examples of wall decoration-as successful as any contemporary work I know of in the country with regard to composition, space, color, and content.

I find no evidence of "sinister" propaganda in the episodes the artist has chosen to depict and it is my personal opinion that to object to certain of the incidents portrayed is to indulge in a form of "witch hunting" which is properly regarded in this country as undesirably un-American.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Thomas C. Howe, Jr.
Director

TCH:ER

ADDISON GALLERY OF AMERICAN ART - PHILLIPS ACADEMY - ANDOVER, MASS.

February 26, 1952

Commissioner W. E. Reynolds
Public Buildings Service
Washington, D. C.

Dear Commissioner Reynolds:

I am writing with reference to the current controversy regarding the status of certain murals by Anton Refregier completed several years ago in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, California. My principal concern is for a guarantee of what amounts to the right of free speech for the artist and the preservation of his integrity as an individual. At the present time when both fascist and communist attitudes toward the arts are arbitrary to say the least, I believe it would be particularly unfortunate to follow the same practice by imposing belated censorship on a point of view which has already been officially approved and for which a considerable sum of public money has been spent.

The issue is not so much the merits or demerits of the work in question as the exercise of a partiality toward differing points of view none of which has the right in a democracy to impose its special will on the others.

I am appreciative of the fact that excessive pressure from one side or the other in any controversy such as is now in question may tend to confuse what I believe to be the main issue. I am sympathetic to the problems of a commissioner when such problems arise and hope that what I have written above may be of some small assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr.
Director

BHH/t.

officially approved and for which a considerable sum of public money has been spent.

The issue is not so much the merits or demerits of the work in question as the exercise of a partiality toward differing points of view none of which has the right in a democracy to impose its special will on the others.

I am appreciative of the fact that excessive pressure from one side or the other in any controversy such as is now in question may tend to confuse what I believe to be the main issue. I am sympathetic to the problems of a commissioner when such problems arise and hope that what I have written above may be of some small assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Bartlett H. Heyes, Jr.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. Bldg. Wash.D.C.

March 26, 1952

Dear Mr. Rothschild:

I have your letter of March 25th with reference to the mural paintings in the Rincon Annex Post Office. I shall be glad to bring your letter to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their next meeting.

Very truly yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Lincoln Rothschild
Executive Director
Artists Equity Association
625 Madison Avenue
New York 22, New York.

def/f

cc to: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts

The Commission of Fine Arts

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Building - Wash.D.C.

March 31, 1952

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 28, 1952, approved the revised design which you submitted for the pedestal of the statue, "The Last Farewell," to be placed in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission noted that this design was made by McKim, Mead & White, Architects, and A. A. Weinman, Sculptor of the monument, and that it is proposed to use Mt. Airy granite for the pedestal.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,
Associate Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT C

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
Public Buildings Service
Washington 25, D. C.

March 11, 1952

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

In Reply Refer To: P

Dear Mr. Finley:

We have given very careful consideration to the problems arising out of the proposed purchase of the Kass property in the Northwest Rectangle. As you know, the President has strongly recommended a dispersal program for Federal Employees in the Metropolitan Area of Washington. Concomitant with this, the National Security Resources Board and the Bureau of the Budget believe there should be a limitation on the number of people to be housed in the District of Columbia.

It has, therefore, appeared for some time that the Northwest Area, which has been included in an area of taking as prescribed by Congress, will not be utilized for Federal office buildings. Recently the District of Columbia has proposed an extension of E Street and the area south of it for a dual highway that would terminate in a new bridge across the Potomac River. From a study of the map, it appears evident that the area north of E Street should probably be developed by private enterprize.

I have informally discussed this matter with our Chief Examiner in the Bureau of the Budget and also with the Consultant to the Bureau of the Budget on dispersal. They believe as I do that these new factors that have come into being in the recent past suggest a re-examination of this whole problem.

There is a further matter to be considered that has given me considerable concern. Congress appropriated funds to purchase the Heurich property because at that time this Company proposed to build a new brewery on the present site. I testified on this question before the Appropriations Committee and clearly indicated the purpose for which the funds were being sought. Although the appropriation language does not definitely limit the areas to be purchased and therefore we would have a technical legal right to use the funds appropriated for these purposes, I seriously question that it should be done without a review with the Appropriations Committee. I again doubt if the Committee would agree.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of the above factors, and let me know of your present thinking on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings

EXHIBIT D

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

We have given very careful consideration to the problems arising out of the proposed purchase of the Hess property in the Northwest Rectangle. As you know, the President has strongly recommended a dispersal program for Federal Employees in the Metropolitan Area of Washington. Consonant with this, the National Capital Planning Commission Board and the Bureau of the Budget believe there should be a limitation on the number of people to be housed in the District of Columbia.

It has, therefore, appeared for some time that the Northwest Area, which has been included in an area of taking as prescribed by Congress, will not be utilized for Federal office buildings. Recently the District of Columbia has proposed an extension of H Street and the area south of it for a dual highway that would terminate in a new bridge across the Potomac River. From a study of the map, it appears evident that the area north of H Street should probably be developed by private enterprise.

I have informally discussed this matter with our Chief Examiner in the Bureau of the Budget and also with the General Counsel of the Bureau of the Budget on disperal. They believe as I do that these new factors that have come into being in the recent past suggest a re-examination of this whole problem.

There is a further matter to be considered that has given me considerable concern. Congress appropriated funds to purchase the Hess brewery property because at that time this Temporary Structure could be built on the present site. I testified on this question before the Appropriations Committee and clearly indicated the purpose for which the property was being acquired. [illegible] does not definitely limit the areas to be purchased and therefore we would have a technical legal right to use the funds appropriated for these purposes, I seriously question that it should be done without review with the Appropriations Committee. I again doubt if the Committee would agree.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of the above matters, and let me know of your present thinking on the matter.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Interior Building - Wash.D.C.

April 2, 1952

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

I received your letter of March 11th, concerning the proposed purchase of certain lots at 25th and E Streets,N.W. owned by the Kass Realty Company.

The Commission considered the matter very carefully at a meeting held on March 28, 1952, and regret, exceedingly, that the five lots in question have not as yet been purchased by the General Services Administration. The Commission recalled that more than a year ago the President of the United States requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to arrange for the purchase of these lots by the Administrator of General Services since they are located in a restricted area, and adjacent to the Rock Creek Parkway along the waterfront.

There is grave danger lest the Kass Realty Company proceed without further delay in the matter of the erection of their proposed apartment building. On the submission of a satisfactory design for the apartment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under what is known as the Shipstead-Luce Act, the Commission of Fine Arts would have to report to the District Commissioners accordingly; and under the law, if the Commission of Fine Arts did not report within 30 days, the Kass Realty Company could demand a permit for the erection of the building. That would be a most serious encroachment on the plans for the locality.

The Commission earnestly hope, therefore, that you will proceed with the purchase of these lots. We hesitate to bring this matter again to the attention of the President; however, if the situation is such that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives do not permit you to use the money necessary to buy these lots out of available funds in your

EXHIBIT E

The Commission considered the matter very carefully at a meeting held on March 28, 1952, and regret, exceedingly, that the five lots in question have not as yet been purchased by the General Services Administration. The Commission recalled that more than a year ago the President of the United States requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to arrange for the purchase of these lots by the Administrator of General Services since they are located in a restricted area, and adjacent to the Rock Creek Park-

There is grave danger lest the Mass Realty Company proceed without further delay in the matter of the erection of their proposed apartment building. On the submission of a satisfactory design for the apartment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under what is known as the Shipstead-Luce Act, the Commission of Fine Arts would have to report to the District Commissioners accordingly; and under the law, if the Commission of Fine Arts did not report within 30 days, the Mass Realty Company could demand a permit for the erection of the building. That would be a most serious encroachment on the plans for the locality.

custody, please advise me at once so that I may bring the matter to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts again at their next meeting.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds,
Commissioner of Public Buildings Service,
Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington D. C.

Sincerely yours

David R. Tinkey,

MR. PEETS: That matter of access to the Air Force Museum brings up a matter that I would like to mention. It seems to me odd that the Commission of Fine Arts has no general power to protect the L'Enfant Plan.

At the present time, several architects are making plans for the redevelopment of Southwest Washington, and I have seen several studies that showed the complete elimination of Delaware Avenue, one of the fundamental radial avenues from the Capitol. Almost every plan that I have seen (except some of my own) anticipate some destruction of the L'Enfant Plan. One plan at the present time eliminates all of Virginia Avenue back of the Freer Museum. It is astonishing, the number of studies being made that involve radical changes in the L'Enfant Plan.

MR. HUDNUT: Is your interest there historical or is it because these avenues are essential to the present life of the city?

MR. PEETS: I think there is still a third possibility. I believe that a great work of art has a right to survive. Were we not discussing a little earlier the sacred character of artistic creation, that an artist's work should not be thoughtlessly destroyed?

MR. HUDNUT: I am not attacking your historical point of view. I am just inquiring if Delaware is really an essential highway or is it merely because it is part of the L'Enfant Plan?

MR. PEETS: My basic position is that the L'Enfant Plan is a total and organic solution. It is a special type of planning that runs through the entire city and is dependent for its value on substantial maintenance of its members. The radial avenues are the organizing force of the plan. If it fell into ruin, I would want to hold these main lines.

I take the position that many of the gridiron streets can be changed

EXHIBIT G

without serious damage. In my studies for Southwest development I have taken out many blocks of the less important perpendicular streets, but leaving intact the main lines, such as Fourth Street, a very fine old commercial street.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Old Four-And-One-Half Street.

MR. PEETS: Yes. But I have advocated in almost all cases that the old rectangular streets be maintained as open vistas, as open spaces where you could walk and get the effect of openness that the L'Enfant Plan gives you, openness in every direction. I would like to see many of those blocks closed to traffic in order to form super blocks for the purposes of development, but I want to have the street trees preserved and the vistas still available.

When it comes to taking out one of the radials, that is another matter. I know it is not possible for the city to grow as it has grown without making many changes, but I feel that those changes should be made with a careful consideration of the main provisions of the L'Enfant Plan, and particularly, in the present case, it is the preservation of Delaware Avenue which I would like to see accomplished.

MR. CAEMMERER: Isn't Delaware Avenue the artery leading from the Capitol Grounds to the War College?

MR. PEETS: Yes, it is.

MR. CAEMMERER: A main artery.

MR. PEETS: That whole area, of course, is almost flat and it is an ideal place for a gridiron plan and straight avenues. There are great elms along Delaware Avenue and at the present time very little traffic, but one never knows what changes will come in the future, and I think main lines should be kept open to permit accommodation to changes that may come in the future.

MR. PEETS: Yes, it is.

MR. CAMMERMEYER: A main artery.

MR. PEETS: That whole area, of course, is almost flat and it is an ideal place for a gridiron plan and straight avenues. There are [illegible] along Delaware Avenue and at the present time very little traffic, but one never knows what changes will come in the future, and I think main lines [illegible] open to permit accommodation to changes that may come in the future.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there a plan on foot now to close off Delaware Avenue?

MR. PEETS: There has been no official action. They have recently made some very radical changes in the redevelopment program changing the areas in which they are goint to start. I cannot say that the present plan indicates the elimination of Delaware.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could that be done without coming before us or the Park and Planning Commission?

MR. PEETS: So far as I know, there is no one empowered to say anything to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the District officials concerning the protection of that or any other element of the L'Enfant Plan.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Suppose the District officials agreed to close it off, would it not go before the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for approval? So should they not be aware of the danger to the L'Enfant Plan?

MR. PEETS: Yes, but I have not had any indication from them that they would oppose it. In the past they themselves have planned many eliminations of L'Enfant streets.

For instance in the development of East Capitol Street their plans have always indicated some elimination of L'Enfant radials. I do not think that they are obliged to consult us. There has to be a public hearing and then the District officials can close the street or make any other disposition of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I suppose in the beginning, I understand the Commission of Fine Arts was the guardian of the L'Enfant Plan.

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes. First, the McMillan Commission Plan of 1901 which restored and enlarged the L'Enfant Plan. From 1902 to 1910 there was no one

in authority to take care of these plans. So when the Commission of Fine Arts took charge in 1910, the first thing they did, they sent for the plans, pictures, and models. They found them in the basement of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and elsewhere. The old model of 1901 we had here in the Commission Room until recently (which is now in the Lincoln Museum) was one of them. The McMillan Plans were highly endorsed by the American Institute of Architects, because they aimed to restore the L'Enfant Plan of 1791.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We did have the guardianship of the plan but the Commission of Fine Arts, until that function was more or less handed over to the Planning Commission, that is, the Park and Planning Commission as I understand it —

MR. CAEMMERER: In 1926.

MR. PEETS: In a sense, I question that since I would not accept the legal terms in which they were given. You say, guardian. That would be sponsor, to use moral influence. It might have been for all plans for the area replanned by the Commission rather than the whole city.

MR. CAEMMERER: From 1910 to 1926, that is 16 years, this Commission was bothered even with changing culverts along the parks or along highways and this Commission would get applications for changes of streets or highways. The Fine Arts Commission did planning work, the park and planning work, up to 1926.

MR. PEETS: Is that so?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes, indeed. It just got to be toomuch.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Is that when the Park and Planning Commission was established?

MR. CAEMMERER: In 1926. They established it as a National Capital Park Commission in 1924 to acquire more park areas. Then they felt that it should be more than that and provide also for planning. So in 1926, there was created by Congress The National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

created by Congress The National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
be more than that and provide also for planning. So in 1926, there was
Commission in 1924 to acquire more park areas. Then they felt that it should
[illegible]: In 1924. They established it as a National Capital Park
[illegible]
MR. BRUNOSCHI: Is that when the Park and Planning Commission was
MR. CAMMERMEYER: Yes, indeed. It just got to be too much.
[illegible]
Arts Commission did planning work, the park and planning work, up to 1926.
Commission would get applications for changes of streets or highways. The Fine
bothered even with changing culverts along the parks or along highways and this
by the Commission rather than the whole city.
use moral influence. It might have been for all plans for the area replanned
terms in which they were given. You say, guardian. That would be sponsor, to
MR. PEETS: In a sense, I question that since I would not accept the legal
[illegible]: In 1926.
it --
Planning Commission, that is, the Park and Planning Commission as I understand
sion of Fine Arts, until that function was more or less handed over to the
CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We did have the guardianship of the plan but the Commis-
because they aimed to restore the L'Enfant Plan of 1791.
The McMillan Plans were highly endorsed by the American Institute of Architects,
sion Room until recently (which is now in the Lincoln Museum) was one of them.
of Congress, and elsewhere. The old model of 1901 we had here in the Commis-
[illegible], and Senate. They [illegible] of the Capitol, the Library
took charge in 1910, the first thing they did, they sent for the plans, pic-
in authority at that time of these plans. So when the Commission of Fine Arts

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Perhaps the Commission of Fine Arts had the original jurisdiction. If they had, I do not know whether it would be proper to ask that in any radical changes in the L'Enfant Plan the Park and Planning Commission consult the Commission of Fine Arts. Would that be a proper thing to do?

MR. CAEMMERER: We used to have joint sessions. We have not had one for two or three years with Park and Planning to work out problems in which both commissions are interested. For instance, this matter of building this garage and office building. It would be a subject of discussion by both Commissions because it establishes questions of policy.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you gentlemen like us to write a letter to the Park and Planning Commission and say that we are concerned about possible encroachments on the L'Enfant Plan with the cutting off of avenues and so on, and that we would like in all cases where some radical change in this thing is proposed, that we have a joint meeting and they consult with us as to the policy involved?

MR. PEETS: Would you let me propose a draft of a letter for you?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I will be glad to sign it.

MR. CAEMMERER: They might be willing to arrange for a joint session next meeting or in May.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Perhaps at the next meeting of the Commission we could have a joint session if there is something pending that is important.

MR. PEETS: At the present time they are so involved in the redevelopment and inner-loop freeway that they won't think about abstractions such as the L'Enfant Plan. But I think a letter on the subject would be very valuable.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you seen this, these recommendations, study by the Department of Highways of the District of Columbia and the Department of Highways of the District of Columbia and the Department of Highways of Virginia

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Perhaps the Commission of Fine Arts had the original jurisdiction. If they had, I do not know whether it would be proper to ask that the Commission of Fine Arts. [illegible] so that

MR. CAMMERER: We used to have joint sessions. We have not had one for two or three years with Park and Planning to work out problems in which [illegible]. [illegible] garage and office building. It would be a subject of discussion by both Commissions because it establishes questions of policy.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you gentlemen like us to write a letter to the Park and Planning Commission and say that we are concerned about possible encroachments on the L'Enfant Plan with the cutting off of avenues and so on, and that we would like in all cases where some radical change in this thing is proposed, that we have a joint meeting and they consult with us as to the policy involved?

MR. PENNYS: Would you let me propose a draft of a letter for you?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I will be glad to [illegible].

MR. CAMMERER: They might be willing to arrange for a joint session next meeting or in May.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Perhaps at the next meeting of the Commission we could have a joint session if there is something pending that is important.

MR. PENNYS: At the present time they are so involved in the redevelopment and inner-loop freeway that they won't think about obstructions such as the L'Enfant Plan. But I think a letter on the subject would be very valuable.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you seen this, these recommendations, study by the Department of Highways of the District of Columbia and the Department of [illegible] and the Department of Highways of Virginia

and the Maryland Roads Commission? It is the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study. That might involve some of these street changes you are speaking of.

Have you seen a copy of this?

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And some changes proposed in here that would violate the L'Enfant Plan?

MR. PEETS: I have not compared them in detail.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

Discussion pertaining to a proposed bridge on the line of E Street, to cross Theodore Roosevelt Island, against which Major General U. S. Grant III (Retired) and Herman Hagedorn, Secretary and Director of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association protested, at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held March 28, 1952.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Hagedorn, you want to talk about the proposed bridge to touch Theodore Roosevelt Island?

MR. HAGEDORN: Yes. The General suggested that I come. I thought I would first of all give you copies of this little pamphlet which has just been released by the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

GENERAL GRANT: I think if you will all look at this picture here first, and then allow me to tell you a little of the history, might be the simpler way to do it.

That island, on which General John Mason lived for a while and which is, as you see, right out between Arlington Memorial Bridge and Key Bridge, and very visible from not only the Washington Monument but the Lincoln Memorial, and our central area of Rock Creek-Potomac Parkway was owned by the gas company and they intended to put a gas-producing plant there when I came to Washington in 1925.

It worried us a good deal because we felt that a gas plant on that island would be somewhat distressing and incongruous and we did a great deal of thinking about what might happen to it. Then we found that the Roosevelt Memorial Association wanted to create a memorial here to Mr. Theodore Roosevelt and we suggested to them that--I say, we,--I mean the National Capital Park and Planning Commission at that time, that maybe if that is--land were bought and developed as more or less natural feature, a little bit of the original country preserved in the midst of the city, so to speak, that it might be very appropriate as a memorial to Mr. Theodore Roosevelt because of his constant harping on the

interest of outdoors and the value of natural things to people, and I think that we felt that it had some historic connotations and would be really a very good element in the setting for the Memorial Bridge and the end of the Mall there.

Then Mr. Olmsted was called in and he studied it and the action was taken, I think, on his recommendation very largely, and then the bill was passed--I suppose you have a copy of that bill which put into legislation the agreement that was reached between the Government and the Roosevelt Memorial Association.

MR. HAGEDORN: The bill is in this pamphlet. It is in the fine print.

GENERAL GRANT: The terms of that legislation have been carried out by the Roosevelt Memorial Association and so far they have made the plans that were needed, and the plans have been approved by the Planning Commission and the Department of the Interior, so that the bargain has been made; but then, during the years since the war, the Congress has been trying to economize; so has the Bureau of the Budget, and the estimates for appropriations for the improvement of park land have been cut out of the Park Service bills every time in appropriations, so they had no money to actually go on with this improvement and the Roosevelt Memorial Association did not press the matter of appropriations very much because they realized the financial situation of the country did make economies necessary. Therefore the island is still very much in the condition in which it was originally acquired excepting that a certain amount of cleaning up and few paths have been put on it and some trees planted. The Park Service has done what it could, you might say, in the way of maintenance.

MR. HAGEDORN: They planted 20,000 trees and shrubs.

GENERAL GRANT: So that there has been improvement but it is along the lines of the plan, but the structures which are not very extensive and which are illustrated in this pamphlet, have not been actually built.

Now then, the District Commissioners come up with a proposal to build a bridge from E Street across to Virginia, going right across the island: it would go just back of the Memorial terrace, and that is not the whole story. That is what they have put up now. But I have seen maps in their office which showed a pretzel, more or less, on the island and a connection with another causeway or something of that sort running out right along the length of the island over here to Rosslyn. I know the Highway Department so well that I know that, although that is not in their present project and they will not confess that it is in their minds, once they have thought of anything that will destroy a few trees and a serene or pleasant view, they will never forget it and they will come up and get authority for it. Their tactics are to go at these things piecemeal. They say this is just a jungle program. General MacCoy wrote to the Engineer Commissioner at my suggestion right away and protested against this. The Engineer Commissioner acknowledged that legislation will be necessary, but there are certain people in Congress who will push anything almost that the Public Roads and Highway Department propose. The situation, I think, is very dangerous and I am hoping that the Fine Arts Commission will join in saying that theirs is a very undesirable project.

Now, in General Robinson's answer to General MacCoy, he says that they don't care where the bridge is as long as it joins approximately the end of New Hampshire Avenue and E Street with the road system over in Virginia. You might as well say he doesn't care where it is as long as it is there where the District authorities have indicated and they will undoubtedly in the course of a year or two, put in for an appropriation to build that bridge--they may feel they will have to have legislation to allow them to build it, but it seemed to me that it would be very advisable for the Fine Arts Commission to give it consideration now

and decide whether they are going to oppose that legislation when it comes up suddenly, as it will probably come up in the summertime when everybody is away and when your staff will need your instructions in order to oppose it.

I also thought that, if we can publish such action on the part of the Fine Arts Commission, it would help us materially in the beginning in raising doubts in their minds about whether they really are going to be able to build it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What is the position of the Park and Planning Commission on this?

GENERAL GRANT: The Park and Planning Commission approved the plan, the present plan, several years ago. Several years ago the Planning Commission made a study of the possibility of putting a bridge in that location and decided that a bridge in that location would not do very much good because it merely joins two parts of the city where the roads are already carrying as much traffic as they can carry and it is not, therefore, going to do very much good.

I saw Mr. Nolen just a moment ago, He said he would be here in a few minutes. He can expand on that study and give you more information.

I have talked to General Robinson about it since and he says that their figures show a bridge in that general location, anywhere between Memorial Bridge and Key Bridge, is absolutely necessary.

MR. HAGEDORN: You saw the editorial in last night's Star? Here it is. Why We Need New Bridges. They said that these estimates are well-founded; that many thousands of cars a day go over the Fourteenth Street Bridge; there should be no question about where the next Potomac River bridge should be built.

So The Star has gone off the deep end.

GENERAL GRANT: It has for the last five years. For the last five years the Star has sided with the Highway Department on the bridge question every time. I do not know how the other papers will stand, but the Star has gone along with the Highway Department on all these mistakes they have made in the last five years and helped them.

Of course, to me, it is just common sense that since we are struggling in Washington as they are in all other cities with over-congestion in the central area, the way to overcome this congestion is not to bring more traffic into the central area, but to provide ways of going around it. We have, therefore, for years in the Planning Commission recommended a new bridge at Alexandria and one further up the river. The Alexandria bridge particularly, because there is an enormous stream of coastal traffic that is going from the south to the north and from the north to the south that now goes through Washington. A bridge at Alexandria would give it a route not to by-pass the city entirely, but to by-pass the central part of the city by going over the new Baltimore Parkway and the Kenilworth Freeway and coming into the eastern part of the city. Vehicles could come into the city from the South over the Alexandria and South Capitol Street bridges, or by-pass the congested area by the Kenilworth Freeway, going over this line which the Highway Department have at least recognized the need for and join the Baltimore Parkway. From these they will have a nice view of the city, of the Capitol, and off in the distance, but they would not have to go through the crowded part of the city.

Of course, the Highway Department's view is that they have too many cars in the central part of the city and they do not realize that when you

facilitate the ways of getting them out, you also facilitate ways of getting them in more.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That other bridge you speak of at Shepherd's Landing?

GENERAL GRANT: Right here.

All right-of-way in the District is owned by the District already and we have succeeded in protecting during the last few years the crossing of the Mt. Vernon Highway with an overhead crossing and a right-of-way through as far as the next street in Alexandria which is now used as a trucking street, and there would be a possibility of joining up with the Shirley Highway if it was worth what it cost at any time.

But the city claim that only, what is it? The figures got from the city are quoted in the Star, how many cars?

MR. HAGEDORN: 24,000 cars and trucks.

GENERAL GRANT: Just to show you what we are up against, Mr. Smith, Congressman Smith, introduced a bill requiring the Commissioners to study the bridge down here (at Alexandria). The Commissioners do not want to build that bridge because it has been suggested by somebody else and not by their Highway Department, to be perfectly frank. It was suggested by the Planning Commission and they have always held off from it, but he introduced this bill and then the Commissioners got the bill changed so that it is to study the location of an additional bridge across the river, so instead of being limited to a bridge in this area, now they will come out with their study which will show the necessity for the E Street bridge that we are worrying about, under that law.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you some legal rights under the contract made?

GENERAL GRANT: It will require legislation but if the Highway Department will come out with this study which will show according to their notions that the bridge is necessary at this site, why then, they will ask for that legislation and it is just that emergency which I feel we should prepare against now.

MR. HAGEDORN: I have only started down here in Washington paying calls on Capitol Hill. I saw a couple of Senators yesterday, two from Kansas. They were very enthusiastic for our plan and said that they would certainly rise and fight.

GENERAL GRANT: You cannot get too many of them.

MR. HAGEDORN: Senator Clements of Kentucky, who is a conservationist, I was told he would be very much on our side, too. So I think we can create a good deal of sympathy for our point of view. These senators were particularly struck with the idea of desecration of a national memorial to a president which did not strike them at all favorably. I stated it raised very considerable support.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You have some access to Roosevelt Island now? That is, by boat?

MR. HAGEDORN: No regular access at all. People go there all the time by canoe. Once a week, the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, conducts a bird walk in the spring and summer and they have a launch to take people out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly that would be destroyed if you had a bridge roaring over the island.

MR. HAGEDORN: We discussed the whole question of the bridge long ago with Olmsted and others, and even a foot bridge was rejected because we felt that anything of that sort would mar the island.

So Olmsted proposed a ferry from Columbia Island to the Lincoln Memorial Watergate.

GENERAL GRANT: There would be a little landing place here below the terrace. There is room on Columbia Island for a parking place where people could leave their automobiles and in the season it would be a very small crossing there.

MR. HAGEDORN: The trustees of the Association want to put up no elaborate memorial whatsoever. There will be no structure, no bust, no monument of any sort, but merely an overlook with an inscription would run around the back wall, facing toward the Lincoln Memorial.

Of course, what appealed to us tremendously was Olmsted's idea of developing a replica of the ancient Potomac forest, the climax forest which at a certain period reaches maturity and then remains for centuries in that condition. Olmsted Brothers had the artist design show what that sort of forest would look like. There is nothing like that within easy reach of a great city and we thought it would be a wonderful thing to have such a forest in the very heart of the Capitol of the United States of America.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems rather shocking to me that the Highway Commissioners can destroy a memorial of this kind by putting a bridge there that was never contemplated. I think it would seem to me your association has some rights that cannot be ignored.

MR. HAGEDORN: We have very definite rights in the matter, and I think that there will be a considerable howl.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could even bring a suit.

MR. HAGEDORN: We have definite rights in the matter and I think we could bring a suit.

GENERAL GRANT: The District Commissioners will try to get the present legislation modified and if they get such legislation, you may have a chance by law to stop it.

MR. HAGEDORN: Yes. Here is the phrasing in the law: "Said island shall be maintained and administered by the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital as a natural park for the recreation and enjoyment of the public: Provided, That no general plan for the development of the island be adopted without the approval of the Roosevelt Memorial Association; and that, so long as this association remains in existence, no development, inconsistent with this plan, be executed without the association's consent."

Now, with regard to the plan, our very good friend, Charles Moore, tipped us off not to wait for the Park Service or anybody else to make the plans and then object to them, or try to improve on them. "Make a plan yourself," he advised. The Fine Arts Commission at that time was very urgent that we should do that. We did it, and engaged Olmsted Brothers to make the plans. It cost $20,000 or something like that. But the plans are complete and ready.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could you possibly carry out those plans now?

MR. HAGEDORN: Oh, my, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would public funds be necessary or would the Association be able to raise it?

MR. HAGEDORN: Public funds would be necessary. In fact, the Congress authorized the funds, appropriated them. This was the phrasing: "That the Director is hereby authorized to provide suitable means of access to and upon the said Roosevelt Island as appropriations are made available from time to time and subject to the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

and that the appropriations needed for such construction and annually for the care, maintenance and improvement of the said lands and improvements, are hereby authorized to be made from any funds not otherwise appropriated from the Treasury of the United States." Which I understand creates a moral obligation on the Congress, but it does not appropriate the money.

Now, the total cost according to a statement made by the National Park Service of the improvements needed, which is a boat landing the overlook, and certain forestry improvements and shelters and rostrums at both ends of the island, and so on, would be about $588,000. That is the sum set down in the bill that has been prepared by General Grant's office or with his counsel at any rate, to present to the Congress.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would be the kind of a measure, it seems to me, that would make it more difficult to put a bridge across.

MR. HAGEDORN: We thought that the offense was probably the best defense in this case.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Would not that be a danger, that after you get through with your plans that they will come back with their strength and move anyway?

MR. HAGEDORN: Of course, there is that danger. But we have a pretty active board of trustees, you will recognize the names of a good many of them, I think; and they are pretty determined.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Certainly, I think it would be much wiser to make a battle now before the thing comes to a head so at least they will be hesitating even in making plans now.

MR. HAGEDORN: That was our feeling.

I saw today a copy of the first of what I am sure will be quite a barrage of letters to General Robinson; and it was very eloquent. I think that we are going to get a lot of letters like that; it is going to make them consider again.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You should not underrate the power of anything that has to do with highways. Those people really know how to go about getting that kind of legislation as they want. They really have a technique to do that.

MR. HAGEDORN: We recognize that. The issue is very interesting because it is an issue between a mechanical and materialistic sense of progress and the intangible values that such a memorial represents.

Of course, you could make a case for turning the Lincoln Memorial into a firehouse, or use it for more direct education purposes than it is being used for now. But it is the sort of thing we have to be fighting all the time, in one way or another.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: One of the most discouraging things was making a parking lot out of the square there between the Department of Commerce and the Post Office Department, using a large part of that area which is a very important part of the setting of those public buildings, to use it as a parking area for the people who work in the buildings.

GENERAL GRANT: That court was really the heart of the 1926 Public Buildings Project, the court you were speaking of between the Commerce Building and Internal Revenue and Post Office.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They insisted they need parking facilities and I asked them if they had any designs on the Mall; that would provide much greater parking facilities. They disclaimed that. They insisted on going through with taking the square part.

MR. HAGEDORN: May I ask a question which seems to me fairly obvious, but I have not heard the answer to it.

I recognize that it would be pretty expensive, but why is not a tunnel being considered?

GENERAL GRANT: It is a matter of expense. We got an estimate back in 1942 or 1943 for a railroad tunnel, hoping that we could put the railroads under the river and then perhaps the railroad bridge that exists might be used for another highway bridge or taken out entirely. The Railroad Engineers estimated it would cost something like $36 million at that time and it would be probably twice that much now, I suppose. That is just more than the city can pay for. They are hoping that they can find some way of raising $146 million which this highway plan is going to need, as they estimate it now.

They have appointed a committee of bankers and businessmen to advise them on how that money can best be raised, but, if they added $50 million to that, you can see that it would be too much--that is their claim, at least.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: General Grant, it seems to me it would make an appeal to the public, but I would think the Government, too, to provide some egress and access to Washington underneath the ground in case of attack. If there were a war, these bridges would be destroyed and Washington would be cut off from access to the south entirely. But if you had an underground tunnel at least the trains could continue to run from the point of view of defending or preparing the city for some possible wartime emergency.

GENERAL GRANT: That was one of the arguments we used when we asked the railroads to give us an estimate on a tunnel. We felt that an underground tunnel might be safer, or at least supplementary to the bridge.

It is interesting also, and I think can be made public now--I mean in this group, it can be told this group--that General Somervelle during the war got two consulting engineers from the country at large. I think one was from New York and one was from Chicago. They were to study the whole bridge question and they were to include the tunnel question. They came to the conclusion that an additional bridge at Alexandria was the best solution and needed immediately, and that the tunnel would not be as safe as the bridges because any injury that happened to a tunnel which might occur from a direct hit or a hit quite near it which would break it in, is so much harder to repair than a bridge which can be repaired under emergency conditions. That was their report.

So it sort of killed the argument that we had been advancing for a tunnel as a war emergency protection.

MR. HAGEDORN: As far as costs are concerned, could there not be tolls charged?

GENERAL GRANT: Yes, but nobody would pay them because the other bridges are toll free, you see, and so nobody would go through the tunnel, if they had to pay to go through, when they could go over a bridge without paying.

MR. de WELDON: In New York City, the Mid-Town Tunnel, people pay gladly to avoid the heavy bridge traffic.

I think as many cars go through the Mid-Town Tunnel as go over the bridge.

GENERAL GRANT: I think it would work out that way if there was any real need for this bridge. But it is my sincere opinion that this bridge will not serve any very useful purpose. People will go over it rather than to go on the more crowded bridges on either side until it becomes as crowded as they are;

but it is not really necessary. The capacity of a bridge is so much greater than the capacity of a street where there are cross streets. It is practically a freeway for the length of the bridge. The real congestion on our bridges is usually due to inadequate approaches, and I think that is true in New York--at least it was my experience when I was going back and forth from Governors Island to New York--The congestion on the bridge is usually caused by the congestion that occurs in the approaches to the bridge, the difficulty for the traffic to disperse or to come in on the bridge, which causes a jam. They go right along on the bridge pretty well, but during the rush-hour going out find at one end of the bridge that the approaches are not adequate; the traffic backs up on the bridge and everybody says the bridge is congested, but it is really the approaches that are inadequate. That is happening to the 14th Street Bridge right now so that they have had to make a temporary connection to open 15th Street to bring traffic in and out from 14th Street Bridge because it is so crowded--just as we told them a few years ago they would have to do. When that traffic builds up some more, (the bridge is already carrying more traffic than they expected the bridge would carry), it will again be congested because the approaches will not carry off any more.

MR. de WELDON: Would the solution be the bridge at Alexandria?

GENERAL GRANT: I think that would divert a considerable amount of the through-traffic and a great deal of the truck traffic.

The last records we had on the 14th Street Bridge showed that about half of the trucks that come across the 14th Street Bridge go into the eastern part of the city. Of course, 14th Street is far west of the center, and they have to come up to 14th Street, go over the bridge and then go back into this (eastern) part of

the city. You have the Navy Yard and you have a good deal of second-commercial and industrial development there--or up in this direction where the freight yards are.

Now, this bridge down here north of Alexandria would, I believe, take off most of that traffic; (indicating) most of that traffic would run up here across the South Capitol Street bridge and up into that area. So I am convinced and quite honestly so, that this bridge would relieve the traffic on 14th Street quite materially for a while, anyway for many years, let us say ten years or something like that.

MR. de WELDON: The perfect connection was Number One Highway.

GENERAL GRANT: And the through-traffic would go up here and if it is automobiles, go on the new Baltimore-Washington Parkway and if it is trucks, it would find its way over Highway Number One.

Is that right, Nolen?

MR. NOLEN: Quite.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like Mr. Nolen to give us the point of view of the Park and Planning Commission?

MR. NOLEN: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we have not taken any position as yet, on the E Street Bridge. It will be taken up at both our April and May meetings but the Commission has been reluctant to take a stand on this specific issue until it has all the facts before it. As you know, all the facts have not been made available as a background for these recommendations on the bridges and highways. The proposals were made public in advance of the publication of the report.

That was so that the Commissioners would have a justification to present to the Congress for the gas tax increase which automatically reverts to three cents from the present four cents as of July 1. That was the reason the program came out in this form when it did.

We hope soon to have available facts to make a proper analysis to back up any opinion about the bridge. However, I think it is only fair for you to recall this, that we have approved, as the law requires, a specific development plan for Roosevelt Island that would not admit of a bridge. That immediately means that if the bridge is to be considered favorably, the Commission is going to have to back up on its previous position on Roosevelt Island taken with the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

My own feeling is that it is not going to back up on its previous position. But we have a different membership on the Commission now and evident differences of opinion with reference to a number of major issues of this kind. So, while I cannot give an affirmative prediction on the issue, at least I can let you know how the matter stands now.

I thought you might be interested in something here that was an approach to this problem that we made in 1941. This bridge is an old idea. It was suggested in 1941 by Arlington County, Mr. Wehrly, who was then on our staff, and a very competent planner, made a report, very brief report on it. One of the interesting things that came out of the study was his concept of the function of the Memorial Bridge in relation to this bridge proposal, which at that time was at Constitution Avenue or alternatively at New Hampshire Avenue. His report was that if the Memorial Bridge traffic streams could be divorced from the general circulation on the District and Virginia side, and a truly commercial bridge

built at Constitution or New Hampshire Avenue, then this thing could be made to work. His conclusion was that it was too late to do that because the Memorial Bridge had been so integrated with the Pentagon road system by the various connections here that you could never divorce the two. Since you could not divorce it, then to put another bridge here, whose approaches would be so interminably tied up and criss-crossed with the approaches of the other two bridges, you would gain nothing by building another one. That was his general approach.

A little better illustration is this diagram here. This shows the different schemes for bridges. This one at E Street, this one at New Hampshire Avenue, this one at Constitution Avenue and this one as a compromise between the two.

These circles indicate points of conflict on the approaches to the two bridges; it is better illustrated here. If each one of these lines is a bridge, it is obvious that the closer the bridges are together, the closer the points of conflict on their approaches are.

In other words, it does not do to increase the number of the common approaches, for it focuses the points of conflict very much closer together. So our reasoning heretofore has been that a new bridge which costs a lot of money would merely create new problems which in turn would cost a lot of money to solve. Then there is the over-all question as to whether it is sound public policy to increase the facilities for getting more traffic into the central area than possibly can be handled in the area as a whole. Related to these issues is the question of whether the Federal Government will adopt a program for ultimate dispersal, or at least a policy of spreading out the Government activity and of limiting the number of Government employees in the downtown area. In these

circumstances would we be warranted in expending a very sizeable sum of public money to increase traffic capacity into the central area principally to accommodate rush-hour movement which is primarily created by the Government, when the Government itself is inevitably going to be driven to a program of spreading out its establishment.

It is true that Congress has not approved the dispersal program but the facts are that it is dispersing its establishment little by little except for the present concentration in temporary buildings which has been going on for some time and which is continuing. Any further development in the central area is probably going to be spread out more in the future when the present emergency is over.

I checked up the other day on the last reports from the Public Buildings Service, and west of the Capitol in the downtown area, there are about 160,000 employees at the present time. Only 100,000 of those are housed in permanent buildings; the rest are in temporary and leased buildings. In our comprehensive plan report we recommended that there be not over 140,000 employees west of the Capitol. So we now have a surcharge or an overload in the downtown area of 15 per cent, we will say, ten to fifteen per cent over what we would ultimately have and that which we would ultimately have would, according to the central area plan, be better spread out, better located from the standpoint of highways so that some of the congestion that the present concentration involves because of location would disappear.

So I rather suspect that if the Commission decides on the one hand to stand by its approval of the Roosevelt Memorial Plan, and on the other hand for traffic and general development reasons feels that another bridge is unwise in the central area, that we will probably have another fight on our hands down on

the Hill because I think it is obvious that the Highway Department having won two major battles on bridges on the Hill is, as a matter of principle, going to fight it out down there again. I think that is already evident from the attitudes shown.

I have heard General Robinson say that they were not going to take a stand, the Commissioners were not, until they had all the facts; but I have seen him quoted in public arguing for the bridge. So it seems to me that they made a commitment, at least if not formally, in their own minds they have made a commitment to this bridge. The unfortunate part about it is that all the facts bearing on the traffic justifications for the bridge have not been obtained and analyzed by the agency that is making the recommendation regarding the bridge.

I know enough about these surveys to know that they can be analyzed in different ways. They have a lot of unknown factors that have to be worked into the sample traffic information that is basically available.

GENERAL GRANT: Maybe at this point it is worth quoting this from General Robinson's letter to General McCoy:

"However, the traffic data which has been collected and studied by the technicians engaged in a comprehensive study of traffic conditions within the Washington metropolitan area indicate that a new crossing of the Potomac River to serve the central area of the city is a must. These studies have convinced our Highway Department that the area of the river between the Lincoln Memorial Bridge and the Francis Scott Key Bridge is the proper location for such a river crossing. The highway system in Arlington indicates that such a crossing should be in the vicinity of E Street, Northwest."

So that while in the beginning he says it can go anywhere, he says what I have read; as you see he is committed to this project. So there is no use in

kidding ourselves that there is going to be any sympathetic consideration of our opposition; that they are not going to try to put it over.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Caemmerer, has this Commission ever taken action on this before? This project?

MR. CAEMMERER: It has endorsed development of Theodore Roosevelt Island; it has stood by that. This bridge project is new.

MR. NEILD: Has never been presented before.

MR. CAEMMERER: Never been thought of seriously because the Memorial Bridge--you see, that was built, and while it was built as a memorial bridge, it has become virtually a traffic bridge and for that the Commission is not to blame.

MR. NOLEN: The Pentagon--

MR. CAEMMERER: That added to the trouble, but in the meantime, I think this Commission has always favored the bridge near Alexandria before they build another one across the Potomac.

I want to say regarding traffic counts, even the District Commissioners have been very much surprised about what happened after a bridge has been built.

For instance, they say down near the Alexandria Bridge there would be only about 20,000 cars which will cross the bridge. They might find in a year's time that 40,000 cars will go over that bridge because conditions will be different to divert traffic. There are also railroad tracks proposed for the Alexandria Bridge. This is a most needed facility since, if the railroad bridge near the Highway Bridge should become impassable, it would be necessary to route trains (both passenger and freight) by way of Harpers Ferry. That would be terrible!

In the case of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, Southeast, they thought they were building 15 years ahead for a bridge; they built a bridge to accommodate

about, as they planned, for thirty or forty thousand cars. Within a year's time they ran over 30,000 and they are running maximum capacity right now on that new Pennsylvania Avenue bridge.

MR. NOLEN: Pennsylvania or South Capitol?

MR. CAEMMERER: Pennsylvania Avenue, the Sousa Bridge.

MR. NOLEN: The figures on the South Capitol bridge are even more astonishing and more analagous because that was a down-river bridge, closed a gap that was driven up into the heart of the developed area. I cannot give you the precise figures offhand, but I know there are over 40,000 cars a day. That is as much as the Highway Bridge was carrying here ten years ago just before the war, in round figures. It is entirely possible for a bridge fulfilling a function that has not been filled before, to develop astonishing traffic potential. I do not know what the estimates were for the South Capitol Street Bridge. I would be interested. I would not be surprised if they were way over what was first thought of.

On the other hand, they had no scientific basis for that.

MR. PEETS: What is the Alexandria Bridge going to do? Would that not add an enormous load to South Capitol?

MR. NOLEN: Yes, but it will in the reverse direction. It will change the pattern there because a great amount of traffic from Southwest Washington comes over South Capitol Street Bridge, M Street, 14th Street Bridge, to Virginia. That is the only way.

GENERAL GRANT: They have to go clear around through the crowded part of the city to get to Virginia from here.

MR. CAEMMERER: It will by-pass Washington.

GENERAL GRANT: People from that whole area in here cannot get over into this area without going up to the city, the crowded part of the city, and coming across the 14th Street Bridge.

Now, if you make a connection in here at Shepherd's Landing, all that traffic, and it must be fairly considerable, will go directly across. So it will put more traffic on the South Capitol Street Bridge for the reason that it will take, undoubtedly, the traffic coming from the south that wants to go into this part of the city. But it will take off the South Capitol Street the part of the traffic that is coming from here over to Virginia.

MR. CAEMMERER: Isn't there a lot of traffic that will by-pass Washington that will cross here and go up Minnesota Avenue on the other side of the Anacostia?

GENERAL GRANT: They have got, quite correctly, this development of a major highway along Kenilworth Avenue parallel with the railroad track here which will enable a big flow of traffic that does not want to stop in Washington to go up along that way to Baltimore.

They like to see Washington but they do not necessarily want to stop there. Having driven through Baltimore, you all know how much you would enjoy having to look at the city but not having to go through the crowded streets.

MR. de WELDON: This eliminated most of the truck traffic, too, which ruins the streets of Washington.

GENERAL GRANT: We would hope so. Of course, the truck drivers like to stop in Washington. There has been an economic advantage in stopping here to get gas because of the higher gas tax in Virginia; and they like to stop here to get lunch, to get a meal.

MR. CAEMMERER: May I ask a question?

How many cars cross Memorial Bridge now, a day?

MR. NOLEN: About 48,000, I believe. I can get those figures in just a minute.

MR. CAEMMERER: About 45,000 each day?

MR. NOLEN: More than its rated capacity.

MR. CAEMMERER: Twenty-five thousand each way?

MR. NOLEN: Not quite that.

MR. CAEMMERER: How many of these 25,000 will use, say, this proposed bridge along E Street, would use it if it were built?

MR. NOLEN: All I know is what I see in the papers. We have no official figures on them at all.

MR. CAEMMERER: They say 20,000 cars. That is the figure given now.

MR. NOLEN: The Star Editorial--did you see the Star Editorial last night?

MR. CAEMMERER: In other words, they are simply taking traffic from Memorial Bridge and putting it on the other bridge.

MR. NOLEN: That is one of the purposes, to relieve the other bridge and provide additional accessibility to the central business district. All this drive, of course, is backed up by concern on the part of the Commissioners that the District is losing values in the downtown area in competition with the suburbs which in turn is in their minds, brought about by the increasing congestion, decreasing accessibility of the central area.

There is some truth, of course, to that fact, but I think there could be a very reasonable difference of opinion as to whether it is going to be stopped by another bridge or not.

MR. CAEMMERER: There might be danger of losing Roosevelt Island, too, if they build a bridge.

MR. NOLEN: The District Commissioners would not be concerned about that.

MR. CAEMMERER: Congress ought to.

MR. NOLEN: That might be. I am just telling you that the District Commissioners do not give two hoots for it. They regard park land as somebody said the other day, all park land is vacant land. Any park or other open land as vacant land to be used as the channels of communication to suit their purpose; that is all. I think that is a true statement. They do not feel they have any responsibility for the park system at all. It is not under their jurisdiction and they do not feel they have a responsibility for it.

GENERAL GRANT: They consider it not only vacant land, but vacant land that is already owned by the Government.

MR. NOLEN: I think that is a fair statement.

This report--I am sitting on a committee that is drafting this report--well, the committee is not drafting the report; the report is being drafted by the Highway people and the committee is supposed to pass on the report, and they have a statement in there that the whole program is based upon traffic considerations and traffic considerations alone, dictated by that and that alone. I think that is a fair statement on the program as a whole. They have not considered the realities of any other point of view and that is to come later after the job is done.

MR. CAEMMERER: Are the Arlington County people interested in this, are they pushing this?

MR. NOLEN: There is some division of opinion in Arlington, I believe, about the necessity for this bridge.

MR. CAEMMERER: That should be the crux of it.

MR. NOLEN: They will have a rather large financial responsibility in connection with it. They will have to make major alterations in the approaches on the other side because the existing approaches to Key and Memorial Bridges must of necessity be the approaches to this bridge because they envelope the approaches; and those approaches on the Virginia side--all you have to do there is see the line-up of cars trying to get across the bridge and its approaches.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Has not the Park and Planning Commission enough weight with the Commissioners so that a well-worded report could be presented to them?

MR. NOLEN: As I indicated earlier, we did not have enough weight not only with the Commissioners, but with the Congress on the two previous bridge situations one of which was not unlike the issue involved here.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Are the arguments heavy enough and logical enough to be overruled?

MR. NOLEN: You must remember, and I think this is a fair statement, that when highway authorities, local, here and the Bureau of Public Roads, national, which controls half a billion dollars worth of money that is distributed every biennium, those two agencies line up before Congress and say, this is it: from an engineering standpoint, this is it. How is Congress going to turn it down? It just is not human nature, that is all.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They are subject to pressures from other sources.

MR. de WELDON: E Street is not a through-street at all?

MR. NOLEN: Unless there is the same thing on this particular issue it will go the same way as the other.

MR. BELLUSCHI: There is no policy there about the Park and Planning Commission to foresee that they will be, probably, having one soon?

MR. NOLEN: It probably won't be until our May meeting because, number one, we will not have all the data and will not have an opportunity to analyze it at all, and if we have a case it had better be well substantiated.

I might say this: there has been appointed a special firm of consultants to make a study of the bridge situation. Whether the contract has been signed today I am not sure but if it is not it will be within a few days. General Robinson told us about it at the last meeting a week ago, that the firm of consultants is to make a study of the bridge situation within the bounds of the District of Columbia. It is in accord with this Act of Congress just passed, signed by the President on March 3. It started out to be a bill to authorize the study for a bridge at Alexandria and it ended up with a general bill to study the whole bridge situation.

Now, that firm of consultants will be employed by the District Commissioners and will be furnished the same information, of course, that was obtained in the original, the origin and destination survey that the Highway Department has had and on the basis of which it had already made its recommendation to the bridge on E Street.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Those experts should really be apprized of the amount of question there is on many people's part. I see that Mr. Moses is on it. I was looking at this list. There is some disagreement about Mr. Moses but since he is in that list, he has a great deal of weight with those kind of people

because he is a practical man and he has done a great many things which people respect him for. I wonder if we could invite him to give his opinion on that?

MR. HUDNUT: That is a serious risk you take there because his opinion will probably be against you.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I say that because it is in the Roosevelt report.

MR. HUDNUT: He will be a witness against you.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If these gentlemen before giving an opinion find out how he feels about it--

MR. HAGEDORN: That would be important.

GENERAL GRANT: I am inclined to be afraid that he would be in favor of a bridge anywhere. An additional bridge is just nuts to Mr. Moses.

MR. HUDNUT: I know it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If he could be convinced that there was really desecration here, that his word would probably have a lot more weight with a lot of people in Congress than others.

GENERAL GRANT: I think park value is something that he would have some consideration for.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are you expecting to have a review of this whole subject at your May meeting?

MR. NOLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would it be useful to have a joint meeting of the two Commissions?

MR. NOLEN: That might be.

The reason I said the May meeting is because we discussed the schedule on it. This is an Act of Congress signed March third and requires this report to

be submitted by the Commissioners in six months. It takes it on until later summer.

The contract that the Commissioners are signing with this firm of consultants has a four-month period on it. The contract comes along to be signed about a month later, a month after the Congress, so that means that it is April, May, June, July, they will have to submit their report sometime the first of August. So General Robinson told the Commission that it would be important for the Commission to get a report of some kind, a recommendation, to consultants or to the Commissioners, then to the consultants, early in their study because by the end of June, they will have pretty well crystallized their conclusions.

I think that obtains for the Fine Arts Commission, too. There would be a definite expression of opinion which ought to be coming as soon as possible; it ought to be backed up by very sound and cogent reasons that will count with people on the Hill as well as with people who have got a lot of hard facts on traffic.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Would not our position make it more desirable for us to be on record now on the basis that a memorial, and the reasons more or less advanced by General Grant rather than wait for it? It seems to me it would be improper not to come out with weighty reasons which for example the Planning Commission could come out with, for us to say that we think the traffic is--would not be aided in one way or another--the approaches of the bridge are not such and so on, would have to be considered somewhat outside our authority but if we would say this would be desecration and make a very strong statement on that, we perhaps could improve our timing and our position.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am inclined to agree with you on that.

I only asked the other questions because I thought you would have the report of the special firm that will be presented at your May meeting, but if you have no further facts before us, then, than you have now, so after these gentlemen leave us the Commission might discuss and decide whether we could come to some conclusion now--

MR. NOLEN: We won't have a report from any firm in May. We simply expect to have made available to us more facts than we have had that have been assembled by the District. The firm is being employed by the District to make a study of all bridge locations up and down the river; I think it is important to the Fine Arts Commission to back up any statement that you make for reasons which are, maybe, quite different from those the Planning Commission might have. I did not mean we would have the same reasons, but if they are esthetic or so on, fine, they ought to be well documented.

MR. NEILD: Does not the fact that the Roosevelt Association acquired and donated this property for the strict purpose as a Roosevelt Memorial, have some bearing in this thing? Would it not affect the title of it?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would think there would be some legal rights the Association had which they could enforce. It would seem to me as an ex-lawyer that you certainly have some rights under this Act of Congress.

MR. HAGEDORN: I should think so, contractual rights.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That perhaps that firm of experts should be informed that there is the obstacle that will come in their thinking.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we understand the situation pretty well now.

Are there any questions?

We have got people waiting out here now who are overdue.

GENERAL GRANT: I do feel that it would be very helpful if the Commission could take action.

(Exeunt General Grant and Mr. Hagedorn.)

MR. PEETS: The question of a new bridge across the Potomac at Roosevelt Island should be considered in relation to the traffic situation at the Lincoln Memorial. That situation is extremely serious--it is tragically unfortunate that traffic must be carried around the Memorial, endangering visitors and preventing comfortable pedestrian movement between the Memorial and the reflecting-basin area. This is ruinously destructive of the dignity, beauty, and monumental significance of the Lincoln Memorial. If a new bridge should permit the elimination of traffic east of the Memorial, I believe we ought to consider carefully before opposing its construction.

Such a bridge would have disadvantages, but it would not "destroy" Roosevelt Island. It would cross the Island at one end and could probably be kept low enough to be below the tree tops and could be carried on posts that would not cut off surface views.

I appreciate the great value of masses of natural foliage around Washington and especially along the Potomac. But I believe that the saving of the Lincoln Memorial is tremendously important and that we should not refuse to consider a proposal which gives promise, however slight, of correcting that deplorable situation.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: For an ordinary island, I think those are very sound arguments, but it seems to me it would destroy the purpose of this particular island which is to keep it as a quiet place for trees and birds, a sanctuary, and so on, for nature walks and that was decided long ago.

I hate to see a memorial of that sort violated now by just traffic conditions. It means that in the future almost any place in the area would be violated if they need more bridges and more arteries of traffic. Also, I do not think it would lessen the noise of traffic around Lincoln Memorial but increase it to have a second bridge so near it.

MR. HUDNUT: Is not this point to be considered, too, that this island is an element in a landscape, this whole area in here is in my judgment landscape to the bridge and the temple, and this bridge is an intrusion to that.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It would be destroying the scale of the island. I feel very strongly about it. I am sorry I do not agree with you.

As a matter of fact, you talk about the tragedy of cars around Lincoln and there I was thinking that human activity around monuments and so on--perhaps the automobile is a different scale, but I do not think is so serious as introducing what would be in scale a very destroying element to the island. I feel rather strongly about it.

MR. HUDNUT: I am with both of you. I agree with you about that traffic around Lincoln Memorial--that is a scandal; but I am against this bridge. We do not, do we, relieve the traffic?

MR. PEETS: The total amount of traffic will not be increased, I think. The new bridge would not open up any new territory from which additional cars would be brought into Washington.

MR. HUDNUT: All this over here--

MR. PEETS: Some of the traffic that comes from the Lee Highway and now crosses by the Memorial Bridge would be caught by a new bridge. I think it is

conceivable that the existence of another bridge would make it possible to revise the traffic movements around the Memorial so that the traffic would not be carried east of it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It would be possible to eliminate the circle. Having less traffic, 30,000 cars instead of 45,000 cars does not make much difference.

MR. HUDNUT: We are going to base our case on such considerations; there are always experts in traffic but ours is something else. If we are going to be opposed to this bridge, we have got to do it on principles of fine arts where we are the experts, you see.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Absolutely.

MR. HUDNUT: One expert against another. We ought not to argue the traffic question with them, but we ought to ask if art considerations are not of greater weight than theirs; I do not know whether it is hopeless or not but that is all we can do.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That is our function. We should direct our views toward the inviolability of Congress--as to the island, the beauty of it in connection with Lincoln Memorial; the fact that a bridge on that site would do irreparable damage and we have nothing to do with the project.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I would like to make such a motion.

MR. HUDNUT: May I suggest that we have a subcommittee to prepare this very carefully?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I was going to ask; I was going to ask you if you would be willing to draw the resolution.

MR. HUDNUT: I was going to suggest Mr. Peets.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He might do a Robert Moses on us.

I have already got Mr. Peets working a letter.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I move the resolution be prepared, worded, and Dean Hudnut be asked to prepare it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you be a committee of one?

MR. HUDNUT: I will gladly do that.

MR. NEILD: I will second that motion.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I made my arguments largely on this pamphlet.

Do you wish to pass two motions at once?

First we might pass the motion that we oppose the erection of the bridge on Roosevelt Island for the reasons enumerated above.

Any further remarks on that?

All in favor will please say aye; opposed, no.

The motion is carried.

Now, we do not need a motion about the Resolution, we will ask Dr. Hudnut if he will be kind enough to draw the resolution for us.

Professor Hudnut drafted the following Resolution:

First Draft April 8, 1952

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS CONCERNING
THE PROPOSED BRIDGE OVER THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

The protection of the parks of Washington is a responsibility which rests upon every agent concerned with municipal affairs. Washington has few parks but they are of supreme beauty and of course must be protected for the benefit of those who live after us.

Whenever, therefore, a proposal is made by any agency for a project which might imping upon a park or number of parks in Washington, this proposal must be given most careful scrutiny to make sure that it is not injurious to the character

and usefulness of the parks. If it should appear that any proposal tends to defeat beauty or usefulness of a park, this proposal must not be adopted until every alternate proposal has been carefully examined and every possible means taken to minimize injury done to the parks.

One of the loveliest areas in the City of Washington is that section of the Potomac which lies north of the Memorial Bridge. By good fortune a lovely stretch of the River has been preserved, together with charming landscapes on all sides. To the west lie meadows crowned by the hills of Arlington; to the east, the white temple of the Lincoln Memorial, with its beautiful embankments and its noble bridge; and at the north lies one of the loveliest fragments of untouched forest lands in any city of America and forming an island of great beauty. This is the Theodore Roosevelt Island.

In the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts the bridge proposed at E Street and carried directly across Theodore Roosevelt Island would in large measure destroy the beauty of this remarkable landscape lying at the very centre of greater Washington. The bridge would bisect the land flying north of the Memorial Bridge and destroy its unity.

The Theodore Roosevelt Island was a gift to the government by a number of friends of President Roosevelt and, in accepting this gift, the government agreed to preserve this land as a sylvan reserve, apart from the city and to preserve it in a natural state, untouched by artificial constructions. Quite aside from its relation to the Potomac landscapes, the island itself is of inestimable value to the City of Washington and in the future this value will progressively increase.

Now, therefore, the Commission of Fine Arts resolves that they will bring these considerations to the attention of those in authority and will urge that the project for the E Street bridge be carefully reconsidered and every alternate proposal examined with the greatest care.

[PUBLIC LAW 722—79TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 955—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 5144]

AN ACT

To establish a national air museum, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established under the Smithsonian Institution a bureau to be known as a national air museum, which shall be administered by the Smithsonian Institution with the advice of a board to be composed of the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, or his successor, the Chief of Naval Operations, or his successor, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and two citizens of the United States appointed by the President from civilian life who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The members of the board shall serve as such members without compensation.

(b) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution with the advice of the board may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of the head of a national air museum whose appointment and salary shall not be subject to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Smithsonian Institution may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient operation and administration of the museum.

SEC. 2. Said national air museum shall memorialize the national development of aviation; collect, preserve, and display aeronautical equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation; and provide educational material for the historical study of aviation.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution with the advice of the advisory board is hereby directed to investigate and survey suitable lands and buildings for selection as a site for said national air museum and to make recommendations to Congress for the acquisition of suitable lands and buildings for said national air museum.

SEC. 4. (a) The board is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations as it deems necessary for the administration of its functions. The board may function notwithstanding vacancies and three members of the board shall constitute a quorum for transaction of business.

(b) The Smithsonian Institution shall include in its annual report of its operations to Congress a statement of the operations of said national air museum, including all public and private moneys received and disbursed.

SEC. 5. (a) The heads of executive departments of the Government are authorized to transfer or loan to said national air museum without charge therefor aircraft, aircraft parts, instruments, engines, or other aeronautical equipment or records for exhibition, historical, or educational purposes.

(b) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, is authorized (1) to accept as a gift to the Smithsonian Institution from George H. Stephenson, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a statue of Brigadier General William L. Mitchell of such character as may be deemed appropriate, and (2) without expense to the United States, to cause such statue to be erected at a suitable location on the grounds of the national air museum.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purposes of this Act and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually hereafter such sums as may be necessary to maintain and administer said national air museum including salaries and all other necessary expenses.

Approved August 12, 1946.

EXHIBIT I

AIR FORCE MUSEUM

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You are going to tell us about the plans for an Air Force Museum and the present status of it?

COLONEL LARSEN: I am very happy to have this opportunity to come here to meet with you gentlemen. Actually, what I can do is two things. I can report on what we have done and what we would like to do.

The Air Force is, I suppose, in terms of the age of its companion services, still a very young service and it has, of course, reached its present stage of development well within the span of any normal man's life-time. But brief though that span of life is, we feel that the Air Force has had a great experience, characteristic of any service, but more specifically pointed up in the Air Force.

Throughout practically all of the 40-odd years that have passed since the Air Force came into existence, it has been hard-pressed both for men and time. It has been loaded with an obligation always just a little beyond its existing capacity to fulfill. So those 40 or more years have been spent in what we think of as a series of hectic spurts of activity to build and meet a pressing danger which seems constantly to be coming to the foreground.

For that reason, and because it is young, the Air Force has not enjoyed the privileges, which the other services had, of long or relatively long periods of comparative peace and tranquility in which they can stop and make a calm evaluation of themselves. It has been easier for us in the Air Force to say that we would look at the history tomorrow or the day after and we have lived always for the future. But as the generation which pioneered the Air Force has started to pass from the active scene, recognition has been given to that solid fact that the future can be most solidly built upon a foundation based on knowledge of the past.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You are going to tell us about the plans for an Air Force Museum and the present status of it?

[illegible]: I am very happy to have this opportunity to come here to meet with you gentlemen. Actually, what I can do is two things. I can report on what we have done and what we would like to do.

The Air Force is, I suppose, in terms of the age of its companion services, still a very young service and it has, of course, reached its present stage of development well within the span of any normal man's life-time. But brief though that span of life is, we feel that the Air Force has had a great experience, characteristic of any service, but more specifically pointed up in the Air Force.

Throughout practically all of the 40-odd years that have passed since the Air Force came into existence, it has been hard-pressed both for men and time. It has been loaded with an obligation always just a little beyond its existing capacity to fulfill. So those 40 or more years have been spent in what we think of as a series of hectic spurts of activity to build and meet a pressing danger which seems constantly to be coming to the foreground.

For that reason, and because it is young, the Air Force has not enjoyed the privileges, which the other services had, of long or relatively long periods of comparative peace and tranquility in which they can stop and make a calm evaluation of themselves. It has been easier for us in the Air Force to say that we would look at the history tomorrow or the day after and we have lived always for the future. But as the generation which pioneered the Air Force has started to pass from the active scene, recognition has been given to that solid fact that the future can be most solidly built upon a foundation based on knowledge of the past.

We have recognized that out of the exploits and sacrifices--and the fun--of those pioneers of the Air Force, what we think is a great service was born. We have also come to see that much of the eloquence of that history is preserved in the mute, yet somehow very coherent actual objects through which history has run its course.

I do not need to tell you what they are--what kind of things they are. The bullet-riddled flag that flew over Clark Field in the Philippines in December, 1941; that is one which constantly comes to our minds. Or you can take such a little, simple thing as the pilot's wings won by General Arnold more than forty years ago, or the airplane in which St. Clair Street made the first flight from the United States to Alaska. All of these are eloquent and graphic reminders of the course of history, and for the Air Force, at least, powerful instruments in the building up of an esprit de corps. You can add photographs, films, fine arts: all of them play their part in establishing a monument to what had gone before and a guide post for the future.

In the past, in the Air Force, because of our hurry and our pressure for time and money, these tangible relics were largely overlooked. And their very nature contributed to their neglect because from the standpoint of military operation, they were mostly obsolete equipment and worn out airplanes which had been hopelessly left behind in the march of time; or they were sentimental mementos, things for which some individual formed an attachment, and usually or often they wound up among the personal posessions of military or civilian members of the Air Arm.

For the most part, anything that has been saved out of the past has been saved largely because some one person had a sentimental interest in seeing that it was not swept away in the march of progress. About a year ago, General Vandenberg directed the Air Force to develop a program to preserve

We have recognized that out of the exploits and sacrifices--and the fun--
of these pioneers of the Air Force, what we think is a great service was born.
We have also come to see that much of the eloquence of that history is pre-
served in the mute, yet somehow very coherent actual objects through which
history has run its course.

I do not need to tell you what they are--what kind of things they are.
The bullet-shaped ship that flew Glenn Curtis' model of the Wright-type in
December, 1941; that is one which constantly comes to our minds. Or you can
take such a little, simple thing as the pilot's wings won by General Arnold
more than forty years ago, or the airplane in which Sk. Clair Street made the
first flight from the United States to Alaska. All of these are eloquent and
graphic reminders of the course of history, and for the Air Force, at least,
powerful instruments in the building up of an esprit de corps. You can add
photographs, films, fine arts: all of them play their part in establishing
a movement to what had gone before and a guide post for the future.

In the past, in the Air Force, because of our hurry and our pressure for
time and money, these tangible relics were largely overlooked. And their
very nature contributed to their neglect because from the standpoint of mili-
tary operation, they were mostly obsolete equipment and worn out airplanes
which had been hopelessly left behind in the march of time; or they were
sentimental memories, things for which some individual formed an attachment,
and usually or often they wound up among the personal possessions of military
or civilian members of the Air Arm.

For the most part, anything that has been saved out of the past
saved largely because some one person had a sentimental interest in seeing
that it was not swept away in the march of progress. About a year ago,
General Vandenberg directed the Air Force to develop a program to preserve

these reminders of a brief but rich experience and formulate for the Air Force a policy to govern their use and disposition. Today, the Air Force has a continuing program which protects them and permits their maximum utilization. The first step in that process lay in describing these treasures in terms which everyone could accept and understand. The second step was to provide for an Air Force-wide search—an Air Force-wide inventory—of these properties so we could determine just what our resources were. Having found that answer, we next have taken steps to protect them by making them a very special kind of Air Force property and we have designated individuals throughout the Air Force to be responsible for them and protect them against misappropriation, exploitation, misuse.

We have also approached the problem of where to place these historical possessions. When we came to that point, certain unalterable facts just simply forced their way into our concept or what we would like to do. Airplanes and much of the specialized equipment which tell the story of what the Air Force is, or has been, are usually bulky objects and, furthermore, the quantity of these items which are so significant in the development of the service is inevitably very great. So consequently a major consideration is that of space.

Out of that problem of space we have come to accept the concept of a storage depot, a central repository in which will be stored all historical properties when they are not in use. We plan to assemble in that repository a master catalog of all of the Air Force historical property. Agencies of the Air Force will draw upon this central depot for such properties or such historical objects as they wish to display in special exhibitions or for general educational or training purposes; and that central depot will also be an agency for assembling the materials which we are gathering for the national Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. That is our present thinking.

AIR FORCE MUSEUM

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You are going to tell us about the plans for an Air Force Museum and the present status of it?

COLONEL LARSEN: I am very happy to have this opportunity to come here to meet with you gentlemen. Actually, what I can do is two things. I can report on what we have done and what we would like to do.

The Air Force is, I suppose, in terms of the age of its companion services, still a very young service and it has, of course, reached its present stage of development well within the span of any normal man's life-time. But brief though that span of life is, we feel that the Air Force has had a great experience, characteristic of any service, but more specifically pointed up in the Air Force.

Throughout practically all of the 40-odd years that have passed since the Air Force came into existence, it has been hard-pressed both for men and time. It has been loaded with an obligation always just a little beyond its existing capacity to fulfill. So those 40 or more years have been spent in what we think of as a series of hectic spurts of activity to build and meet a pressing danger which seems constantly to be coming to the foreground.

For that reason, and because it is young, the Air Force has not enjoyed the privileges, which the other services had, of long or relatively long periods of comparative peace and tranquility in which they can stop and make a calm evaluation of themselves. It has been easier for us in the Air Force to say that we would look at the history tomorrow or the day after and we have lived always for the future. But as the generation which pioneered the Air Force has started to pass from the active scene, recognition has been given to that solid fact that the future can be most solidly built upon a foundation based on knowledge of the past.

CHAIRMAN TIMMEY: You are going to tell us about the plans for an Air Force Museum and the present status of it?

COLONEL IARSEN: I am very happy to have this opportunity to come here to meet with you gentlemen. Actually, what I can do is two things. I can report on what we have done and what we would like to do.

The Air Force is, I suppose, in terms of the age of its companion services, still a very young service and it has, of course, reached its present stage of development well within the span of any normal man's life-time. But brief though that span of life is, we feel that the Air Force has had a great experience, characteristic of any service, but more specifically pointed up in the Air Force.

Throughout practically all of the 40-odd years that have passed since the Air Force came into existence, it has been hard-pressed both for men and time. It has been loaded with an obligation always just a little beyond its existing capacity to fulfill. So those 40 or more years have been spent in what we think of as a series of hectic spurts of activity to build and meet a pressing danger which seems constantly to be coming to the foreground.

For that reason, and because it is young, the Air Force has not enjoyed the privileges, which the other services had, of long or relatively long periods of comparative peace and tranquility in which they can stop and make a calm evaluation of themselves. It has been easier for us in the Air Force to say that we would look at the history tomorrow or the day after [illegible] Lived always for the future. But as the [illegible] to that solid fact that the future can be most solidly built upon a foundation [illegible].

We have recognized that out of the exploits and sacrifices--and the fun--of those pioneers of the Air Force, what we think is a great service was born. We have also come to see that much of the eloquence of that history is preserved in the mute, yet somehow very coherent actual objects through which history has run its course.

I do not need to tell you what they are--what kind of things they are. The bullet-riddled flag that flew over Clark Field in the Philippines in December, 1941; that is one which constantly comes to our minds. Or you can take such a little, simple thing as the pilot's wings won by General Arnold more than forty years ago, or the airplane in which St. Clair Street made the first flight from the United States to Alaska. All of these are eloquent and graphic reminders of the course of history, and for the Air Force, at least, powerful instruments in the building up of an esprit de corps. You can add photographs, films, fine arts: all of them play their part in establishing a monument to what had gone before and a guide post for the future.

In the past, in the Air Force, because of our hurry and our pressure for time and money, these tangible relics were largely overlooked. And their very nature contributed to their neglect because from the standpoint of military operation, they were mostly obsolete equipment and worn out airplanes which had been hopelessly left behind in the march of time; or they were sentimental mementos, things for which some individual formed an attachment, and usually or often they wound up among the personal posessions of military or civilian members of the Air Arm.

For the most part, anything that has been saved out of the past has been saved largely because some one person had a sentimental interest in seeing that it was not swept away in the march of progress. About a year ago, General Vandenberg directed the Air Force to develop a program to preserve

We have recognized that out of the exploits and sacrifices--and the fun-- of those pioneers of the Air Force, what we think is a great service was born. We have also come to see that much of the eloquence of that history is preserved in the mute, yet somehow very coherent actual objects through which history has run its course.

I do not need to tell you what they are--what kind of things they are. The bullet-riddled flag that flew over Clark Field in the Philippines in December, 1941; that is one which comparatively comes to our minds. Or you can take such a little, simple thing as the pilots wings won by General Arnold more than forty years ago, or the airplane in which St. Clair Street made the first flight from the United States to Alaska. All of these are eloquent and graphic reminders of the course of history, and for the Air Force, at least, powerful instruments in the building up of an esprit de corps. You can add photographs, films, fine arts: all of them play their part in establishing a monument to what had gone before and a guide post for the future.

In the past, in the Air Force, because of our hurry and our pressure for time and money, these tangible relics were largely overlooked. And their very nature contributed to their neglect because from the standpoint of military operation, they were mostly obsolete equipment and worn out airplanes which had been hopelessly left behind in the march of time; or they were sentimental memories, things for which some individual formed an attachment, and usually or often they wound up among the personal possessions of military or civilian members of the Air Arm.

For the most part, anything that has been saved out of the past has been saved largely because some one person had a sentimental interest in seeing that it was not swept away in the march of progress. About a year ago, General Vandenberg directed the Air Force to develop a program to preserve

these reminders of a brief but rich experience and formulate for the Air Force a policy to govern their use and disposition. Today, the Air Force has a continuing program which protects them and permits their maximum utilization. The first step in that process lay in describing these treasures in terms which everyone could accept and understand. The second step was to provide for an Air Force-wide search—an Air Force-wide inventory—of these properties so we could determine just what our resources were. Having found that answer, we next have taken steps to protect them by making them a very special kind of Air Force property and we have designated individuals throughout the Air Force to be responsible for them and protect them against misappropriation, exploitation, misuse.

We have also approached the problem of where to place these historical possessions. When we came to that point, certain unalterable facts just simply forced their way into our concept or what we would like to do. Airplanes and much of the specialized equipment which tell the story of what the Air Force is, or has been, are usually bulky objects and, furthermore, the quantity of these items which are so significant in the development of the service is inevitably very great. So consequently a major consideration is that of space.

Out of that problem of space we have come to accept the concept of a storage depot, a central repository in which will be stored all historical properties when they are not in use. We plan to assemble in that repository a master catalog of all of the Air Force historical property. Agencies of the Air Force will draw upon this central depot for such properties or such historical objects as they wish to display in special exhibitions or for general educational or training purposes; and that central depot will also be an agency for assembling the materials which we are gathering for the national Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. That is our present thinking.

these reminders of a brief but rich experience and formulate for the Air Force a policy to govern their use and disposition. Today, the Air Force has a continuing program which protects them and permits their maximum utilization. The first step in that process lay in describing these treasures in terms which everyone could accept and understand. The second step was to secure [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Having found that answer, we next have taken steps to protect them by making them a very special kind of Air Force property and we have designated individuals throughout the Air Force to be responsible for them and protect them against misappropriation, exploitation, misuse.

We have also approached the problem of where to place these historical possessions. When we came to that point, certain unalterable facts just simply forced their way into our concept or what we would like to do. Airplanes and much of the specialized equipment which tell the story of what the Air Force is, or has been, are usually bulky objects and, furthermore, the quantity of these items which are so significant in the development of the service is inevitably very great. So consequently a major consideration is that of space.

Out of that problem of space we have come to accept the concept of a storage depot, a central repository in which will be stored all historical properties when they are not in use. The plan to assemble in that repository a master catalog of all of the Air Force historical property. Agencies of the Air Force will draw upon this central depot for such properties or such historical objects as they wish to display in special exhibitions or for general educational or training purposes; and that central depot will also be an agency for assembling the materials which we are gathering for the national Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. That is our present thinking.

We are now at the point where we are trying to think of the future and in that phase of our activity we have gotten beyond that central repository phase. We recognize that one of the broadest uses of these properties would lie in the general education of military personnel and the public in the history and services of the Air Force. So far as the Air Force is concerned, the instillation of an esprit de corps is a major and very important factor.

The Air Force plans, therefore, that, when an Air Force Academy comparable to West Point or Annapolis is authorized, we will install at that academy a modern, up-to-date, and comprehensive Air Force Museum. We have asked ourselves the question of how better we could use those properties for education and the building of an esprit de corps than by placing them at the Academy which is, after all, the fountainhead for the Air Force Officer Corps. That museum, when we build it, will be open to the public and to military personnel alike. In it we plan to house the Air Force Fine Arts Collection. That collection at the present time is fragmentary. It is incomplete. But even in its present state, when we have not located all the materials which we know are in existence, we still find that we have about 600 items, and some of them are very fine. But also we will display in what we hope will be tasteful fashion and effective method diorama and display groups which will show the evolution of the air arm. We think that that museum will be an important part of the Air Force's educational system.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Colonel Larsen. As I understand it from what you have said, the immediate task is assembling the material that you want to preserve.

COLONEL LARSEN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And placing it in a store house, then awaiting the development of plans for the Air Museum which would not be here in Washington.

COLONEL LARSEN: I am sure it would not be. Of course, we realize that as far as Washington is concerned the general public is very well served by

We are now at the point where we are trying to think of the future and in that phase of our activity we have gotten beyond that central repository phase. We recognize that one of the broadest uses of these properties would lie in the general education of military personnel and the public in the history and services of the Air Force. So far as the Air Force is concerned, the installation of an esprit de corps is a major and very important factor.

The Air Force plans, therefore, that, when an Air Force Academy comparable to West Point or Annapolis is authorized, we will install at that academy a modern, up-to-date, and comprehensive Air Force Museum. We have asked ourselves the question of how better we could use those properties for education and the building of an esprit de corps than by placing them at the Academy which is, after all, the fountainhead for the Air Force Officer Corps. That museum, when we build it [illegible] will be open to the public [illegible] alike. In it we plan to [illegible]. The collection at the present time is fragmentary. It is incomplete. But even in its present state, when we have not located all the materials which we know are in existence, we still find that we have about 600 items, and some of them are very fine. But also we will display in what we hope will be tasteful fashion and effective method dioramas and display groups which will show the evolution of the air arm. We think that that museum will be an important part of the Air Force's educational system.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: Thank you, Colonel Larsen. As I understand it from what you have said, the immediate task is assembling the material that you want to [illegible].

COLONEL LARSEN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: And placing it in a store house, then awaiting the development of plans for the Air Museum which would not be here in Washington.

COLONEL LARSEN: I am sure it would not be. Of course, we realize that as far as Washington is concerned the general public is very well served by

the National Air Museum which is a function of the Smithsonian and the building up of which, the Air Force participates in a very considerable fashion. One of the objectives of this program that we have now got under way is to get so thorough an acquaintance with what the Air Force has that we will be able to help build up an adequate collection of materials for the National Air Museum. That is a continuing program and it is a program which I can see will become much more efficient with the full operation of this New Air Force Program.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: So that you will have eventually two museums, one here, the National Air Museum in Washington as part of the Smithsonian Institution, and one, as you said, at the Air Force Academy, wherever it might be. The second one is the one you are dealing with.

COLONEL LARSEN: In the future plan.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How can the Commission be of help to you in that?

COLONEL LARSEN: I do not know at this moment that it can be, but I was very grateful for an opportunity to appear before you and tell you which way we are headed because there very likely will come a time when the Commission can help. At the present time, of course, there is no authorization for an Air Force Academy. There have been, over the period of the last four years, something like 360-some bills introduced in Congress to authorize the Academy all at specific sites. The Air Force has established a very distinguished committee which in its turn has surveyed all of the sites which have been proposed, some over 300 of them, a monumental task, and it has narrowed down what it considers the acceptable areas to, I believe, seven sites. It is hoped that when the Academy is established it will be one of those seven sites which will be authorized in the legislation. In the meantime, political consideration, I suppose, is the primary reason why the action has not been pressed and why the Academy has not yet been authorized. I know it is very earnestly

ing up of which, the Air Force participates in a very considerable fashion.

get so thorough an acquaintance with what the Air Force has that we will be able to help build up an adequate collection of materials for the National Air Museum. That is a continuing program and it is a program which I can see will become much more efficient with the full operation of this New Air Force program.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: So that you will have eventually two museums, one here, the National Air Museum in Washington as part of the Smithsonian Institution, and one, as you said, at the Air Force Academy, wherever it might be. The second one is the one you are dealing with.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How can the Commission be of help to you in that?

COLONEL HARSEM: I do not know at this moment that it can be, but I was very grateful for an opportunity to appear before you and tell you which way we are headed because there very likely will come a time when the Commission can help. At the present time, of course, there is no authorization for an Air Force Academy. There have been, over the period of the last four years, something like 360-some bills introduced in Congress to authorize the Academy all at specific sites. The Air Force has established a very distinguished committee which in its turn has surveyed all of the sites which have been proposed, some over 300 of them, a monumental task, and it has narrowed down what it considers the acceptable areas to, I believe, seven sites. It is that when the Academy is established it will be one of those seven sites which will be authorized in the legislation. In the meantime, political considera-
tion, I suppose, is the primary reason why the action has not been pressed and why the Academy has not yet been authorized. I know it is very earnestly

desired by the Air Force.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right. I am very glad you have come and I think we do understand it now. I had not realized the intention of having two separate museums and as this is developed and comes before us, we will be prepared to act on it.

COLONEL LARSEN: We feel as far as the Air Force is concerned that there is a very overriding need for the National Air Museum in the Smithsonian. There in its true perspective the whole progress of aviation is depicted. But for the Air Force itself, the National Air Museum alone is not sufficient because it does not give distinctiveness necessary or distinction to the Air Force. So we set this Air Force Museum idea up primarily for the, shall I say, for the effect it will have upon the up-coming generation of Air Force men and Women.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much. Are there any questions you gentlemen would like to ask Colonel Larson?

MR. deWELDON: I would like to ask if the paintings the Air Force has will be housed in that museum?

COLONEL LARSEN: Yes, sir. We have some very fine things now. Most of them, however, are of a contemporary or near-contemporary period and historically we suffer great gaps in coverage of the air activity. Fortunately, I believe there is a very substantial record of the air arm in World War I now in the Smithsonian, the National Museum. We have primarily art coverage for World War II and the succeeding period.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And you plan to take the things now in the Smithsonian for the Air Force Museum?

COLONEL LARSEN: That is a question which I cannot answer. We would like to have some of those things, but I do not think that anyone in the Air Force would feel that under any circumstances we would have the right to be Indian givers and we would hope that the National Air Museum out of its own generosity would wish

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right. I am very glad you have come and I think we do understand it now. I had not realized the intention of having two separate museums and as this is developed and comes before us, we will be prepared to [illegible].

COLONEL LARSON: We feel as far as the Air Force is concerned that there is a very overriding need for the National Air Museum in the Smithsonian. There in its true perspective the whole progress of aviation is depicted. But for the Air Force itself, the National Air Museum alone is not sufficient because it does not give distinctiveness necessary or distinction to the Air Force. So we set this Air Force Museum idea up primarily for the, shall I say, for the effect it will have upon the up-coming generation of Air Force men and women.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much. Are there any questions you gentlemen would like to ask Colonel Larson?

MR. DEMARTON: I would like to ask if the paintings the Air Force has will be housed in that museum?

COLONEL LARSON: Yes, sir. We have some very fine things [illegible] of them, however, are of a contemporary or near-contemporary period and historically we suffer great gaps in coverage of the air activity. Fortunately, I believe there is a very substantial record of the air arm in World War I now in the Smithsonian, the National Museum. We have primarily art coverage for World War II and the succeeding period.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And your plan to take the things now in the Smithsonian for [illegible]

COLONEL LARSON: That is a question which I cannot answer. We would like to have some of those things, but I do not think that anyone in the Air Force would feel that under any circumstances we would have the right to be Indian givers and we would hope that the National Air Museum out of its own generosity would wish

to see that we had some representation of that earlier period in the Air Force Museum.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much.

COLONEL LARSEN: Thank you for letting me come. I am very happy to have met you gentlemen.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Interior Bldg. - Wash. D. C.

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO MR. HALL OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, and others.

April 3, 1952

Dear Mr. Hall:

As you know, the President requested the Commission of Fine Arts to conduct an inquiry of the Government's activities in the field of art and to make recommendations as to how these activities could be reorganized and integrated both under wartime conditions and in normal times.

We plan, therefore, to call attention to the importance of quality in works of art produced by various Government establishments. We may also recommend more liberal payment of artists employed by the Government to do this work. In order to determine whether such a recommendation would be justified, we should have the facts as to present salaries or fees and as to the qualifications required by the Civil Service.

Would it be possible for you to supply the Commission of Fine Arts with essential information concerning typical positions involving creative art work in your organization? We do not, of course, wish to have the names of the persons at present employed on such work, and we need only a few examples,--not more than three or four of such positions.

We are interested in knowing the title of job, grade, pay, kind of work done, and required qualifications. Copies of citations of Civil Service job descriptions, examinations, etc., would be appreciated. Summaries of the education and experience of incumbents, if available, would also be very helpful; and we would be glad to have any suggestions that would guide us in making recommendations as to procedure in securing the services of competent personnel in the field of aesthetic design with which your Bureau is concerned.

EXHIBIT K

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Interior Bldg. - Wash. D. C.

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO MR. HALL OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, and others.

April 3, 1952

Dear Mr. Hall:

As you know, the President requested the Commission of Fine Arts to conduct an inquiry of the Government's activities in the field of art and to make recommendations as to how these activities could be reorganized and integrated both under wartime conditions and in normal times.

We plan, therefore, to call attention to the importance of quality in works of art produced by various Government establishments. We may also recommend more liberal payment of artists employed by the Government to do this work. In order to determine whether such a recommendation would be justified, we should have the facts as to present salaries or fees and as to the qualifications required by the Civil Service.

Would it be possible for you to supply the Commission of Fine Arts with essential information concerning typical positions involving creative art work in your organization? We do not, of course, wish to have the names of the persons at present employed on such work, and we need only a few examples,--not more than three or four of such positions.

We are interested in knowing the title of job, grade, pay, kind of work done, and required qualifications. Copies of citations of Civil Service job descriptions, examinations, etc., would be appreciated. Summaries of the education and experience of incumbents, if available, would also be very helpful; and we would be glad to have any suggestions that would guide us in making recommendations as to procedure in securing the services of competent personnel in the field of aesthetic design with which your Bureau is concerned.

EXHIBIT K

With many thanks for your cooperation in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Honorable Alvin W. Hall, Director,
Bureau of Engraving and Printing,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

With many thanks for your cooperation in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Alvin W. Hall, Director,
Bureau of Engraving and Printing,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.